DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 719 EA 006 840

AUTHOR	Mallery, David
TITLE	The Strengths of a Good School Faculty: Notes on Evaluation, Growth, and Professional Partnership of Teachers.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Independent Schools, Boston, Mass.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	96p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Independent Schools, 4 Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Development; *Effective Teaching; *Measurement Instruments; Private Schools; *Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

The thesis of this document is that evaluation of teachers and administrators should include the identification of strengths and the furthering, developing, and extending of them. Evaluation is examined from the point of view of heads of schools, teachers, parents, and students and concrete steps toward a good evaluation are suggested. A supplement contains bibliographies and evaluation instruments. (Author/MLF)

ED102719

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Strengths of a Good School Faculty

Notes on Evaluation, Growth, and Professional Partnership of Teachers

David Mallery

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NAIS
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

EA 006 840

January 1975

National Association of Independent Schools

4 Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Copyright © 1975 by the National Association of Independent Schools
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review to be printed in a magazine or newspaper.

Printed in U.S.A.

Additional copies may be ordered at $3.00 each from

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
4 Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Contents

1. Building on Strengths 1

Whoever started the notion that strengths are embarrassing and weaknesses comforting? 1
"Everybody" is talking about teacher evaluation. What might it really turn out to mean? 3
Heads of schools are talking... 4
Teachers are talking... 5
An inside-outside pro is talking... 6
Parents are talking... 7
Students are talking... 9
First the whole faculty WE and the WE's within the faculty 10
Then the ME among the faculty 12

2. Steps toward a Good Evaluation in a School 14

The faculty commits itself to exploring evaluation for teachers and administrators 14
The committee is the center of the developing evaluation process but keeps connected with the rest of the faculty 15
Criteria for US as a faculty 16
Criteria for ME as a teacher 17
Colleague-observers 18
Trying out a range of instruments 20
A special plea for imaginative use of the video-tape machine 21
Student evaluation of teachers 23

Exhibits

I. Thirteen Key Readings for a Faculty Launching Its Study of Teacher Evaluation 29
II. On Teaching and Learning: Some Basic Readings for Teachers 32
III. Northfield Mount Hermon School's Faculty-Evaluation Program 34
IV. Notes and Fragments on Teacher Evaluation from the Lower School at Sidwell Friends School 55
V. "Professional Staff" 69
VI. Independent Schools and Teacher Evaluation 77
VII. A Useful Perspective on Teacher-Students-Curriculum in Teacher Evaluation 82
VIII. A Self-Assessment Questionnaire on Personal and Social Learning 88

1

Building on Strengths

Whoever started the notion that strengths are embarrassing and weaknesses comforting?

The strengths of a faculty are often part of a school's folklore: old Miss Swift . . . the History Department . . . those three young Turks. Sometimes the strengths can be divisive, antipartnership: "The science people lobby so hard for money and time that the rest of us take the leavings . . ." "Mr. Mason is the one who's so great with kids. Let *him* handle the personal problems, and I'll teach math . . ." "The headmaster (does anyone rule out the head as a member of the faculty?) takes care of innovation around here. We brace for some kind of jolt every time he comes back from a conference."

In all the talk and studies on "evaluation" of teachers and administrators over the past fifty years, a heartening theme is increasingly heard: the idea of identifying strengths and furthering them, nurturing them, developing them, extending them in a teacher's work, in a department, in a whole school, perhaps on into the community and beyond, into "education" itself.

It is ironic that focusing on strengths is so often a surprise to people. Certainly the word "evaluation" has long been a scary one among teachers, with frightening Star Chamber overtones. Recent efforts to change these overtones are sometimes hilarious when only the vocabulary changes and nothing else does. (Some schools or school systems that have shifted from "evaluation" to "appraisal" or "supervision" get into some interesting problems, as when "supervision" is applied to what colleagues are doing and what students are doing in relation to teachers![1])

There's a lot more to it all than vocabulary, but it really looks as if, in our history, there is embedded a habit of focusing on weaknesses when we are trying to get a sense of how a group or an individual is doing. A three-year-old breaks a vase and he is punished. He doesn't break the vase and he is simply "behaving himself." A student gets an A—, three B's, and a C—.

[1]See *Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs* (1974; National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209), p. 63.

Parents and teachers and the kid himself go into orbit about the C—. Traditionally, academic papers are "corrected," that is, the mistakes are marked, often, for emphasis, in red. Presumably the good parts of the paper are where n g has been written.

While this kind of thing seems to have gotten formally built into education, it happens everywhere. I recently told the manager of a small summer golf club how much people appreciated his skill in dealing with at least twenty-four "bosses" and his and his wife's graciousness to us all. He was dismayed, then delighted, then admitted that there had been very few complaints—"Nobody has said anything." He had been doing his job. Hence the silence. A few minutes later I saw a boy walk off a tennis court after a hard-won victory. "My ground strokes were a mess and I couldn't get the second serve right. I was lucky to win . . ." The same tradition. I hear it echoing right out of the mother who is reacting to her child's report card and a teacher's very negative written comment following an A—: "I have a feeling the idea they have down there is to evaluate the kids not on how far they've come from zero but on how far they still are from perfect."

In exploring "evaluation" of anybody in a school, we would do well to begin by watching out for the old habit of going after weaknesses and just "assuming" strengths in ourselves and others. I saw this happen in a one-day seminar with George I. Brown[2] and twenty-five teachers. At one point we were in groups of four and were asked to think of a time when, as teachers, we really messed up. Even though we were given a couple of minutes to think of an example, all of us were falling all over ourselves to start to tell our experiences. It was easy to find examples and natural to tell about them. Our next task was to describe a time we felt we had done really well as teachers. Embarrassment was acute. We had a terrible ti finding anything or finding a way to tell about what we could dredge u ur moments of admitted success seemed like some kind of guilty secret. r moments of messing up were appropriate material for conversation.

This has plenty to do with schools that work well, with the way students and teachers and administrators and board members are treated and treat each other. We have come a long way in many (some?) schools in identifying and building on the strengths of *students*. We also have a long way to go on this.

In one of the best collections of writing about the education of teachers I have come on, Theodore Sizer has this to say about students and self-regard:

> It is obvious that a self-confident, self-aware student is more able to capitalize on abstract learning than is a youngster personally at sea. A youngster who believes in himself believes in his future and is likely to devote energy and effort to improve that future. The child's future is, of course, what education is all

[2]Author of *Human Teaching for Human Learning: An Introduction to Confluent Education* (New York: Viking, 1971).

about: Schooling for him is an investment. However, some classroom teachers act as if self-confidence is but a secondary responsibility, being the primary responsibility of someone called counselor. The notion that a teacher of mathematics or of British History has a responsibility to build the confidence of a youngster often does not cross that teacher's mind. Somehow he believes that it is quite acceptable to terrorize, harass, and insult youngsters (however unwittingly) in the interests of inculcating a subject; children's sensitivity and self-regard is of secondary concern in teaching the discipline at hand. Our "realistic" social scientist, however, would suggest that a student's self-regard (or future orientation) is a precondition for his achievement of both cognitive or affective ends and thus should be a primary task for teaching.[3]

A ringing amen to that, plus clear notice that this appears in a discussion of educating *teachers* and applies very much indeed to the way teachers and administrators need to be treated and their self-regard paid attention to.

I am seeing more and more report-card comments, in quite different schools, that describe a student's strengths in the work he is doing, and interwoven with this description are notes on needed improvements. A lot of the independent-study experiences, mini-courses, and field projects seem to assume strengths that students are working from or adding to or using more fully than in the routine assign-and-recite class experience. Yet I am dismayed to see how easy it is to miss the implications for teachers in these ways of evaluating students. Until teacher-evaluation programs do pay attention to strengths, and to building on them toward the kinds of professional growth and soaring that ideally we would like to have for our teachers, "evaluation" will keep right on being something that is inflicted on teachers. Such an exposure of faults, under unpleasant conditions, is almost a professional assault, one that invites defensiveness and divisiveness in a faculty.

As pressures mount for more formal evaluation, as rhetoric about accountability whirls around schools and communities, it will be all too easy for teachers and administrators to fall into check-off lists, often tried and abandoned as far back as the 1930's, and even into vigilante assessment committees and programs, which put down and cut up teachers without regard to individual strengths or to how they can be nurtured and shared.

"Everybody" is talking about teacher evaluation. What might it really turn out to mean?

Here are some voices, from inside or outside of school buildings. These voices are heard in whispers, proclaimings, pleas, public speeches and writings, private conversations and searchings. Or, sadly, they may hardly be

[3]Theodore R. Sizer, "Teacher Education for the 1980's," in Donald J. McCarty and associates, *New Perspectives on Teacher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. 49.

heard at all. These are voices I have "heard" again and again in my own encounters with people in schools, conferences, seminars, living rooms, fields and woods—and in print. I am paying special attention here to those I have literally heard, since my journeys among school people often interweave surprisingly with what I read. But what I have read on teacher evaluation in the past year or so has illuminated—and complicated—my own meanings for it. This report includes articles, books, and other sources of information that may be helpful. A school needs both its own voices from inside and those from outside, as does any visitor or commentator on education.

Here are some voices that say something about teacher evaluation, even sometimes when that is not supposed to be the topic of conversation. See if any of them evoke familiar feelings, needs, irritations, ideas, hopes, or possibilities as you read.

Heads of schools are talking. . .

> I want to have some "tangible evidence" to use to get rid of a teacher who should not be teaching in this school.
>
> I have a small, even token, amount of money to symbolize (if not recognize) "merit" in teaching. I want a way of identifying teachers of special skills so that I can make these salary bonus adjustments more wisely.
>
> We have some dying, not dead but dying, wood in the school faculty. I want a way to bring this dying wood to some life. We need an evaluation system to help us do this.
>
> I want to get a better sense of how good we are as a school, how good we are and how we can be better.

And here are five school heads, with pencil in hand, each looking at his own behavior and noting "some distressing conclusions"—but also implying some heartening possibilities.

> *I find security in working on problems that will yield definitive solutions.* Whether it is the balance sheet, the attendance record, or the school lunch report, there is something satisfying about ending up with a precise, specific answer. Certainly some of these activities are necessary, but there is less danger that I will neglect them than that I will unconsciously concentrate on them to the detriment of problems that are more ghostly in format and conclusion.
>
> *I Like Organization and Predictability.* As an administrator I like to know what is going to happen, where, when, who is in charge, and what or who will be affected. Administration in this sense, permits control—but sometimes at the expense of innovation. Schedules and flow charts ensure predictability, but they outlaw serendipity and hobble creative alternatives.
>
> *I favor problems I've encountered before.* Experience is a good teacher, but if I'm not careful it becomes a permanent boarder. I not only tend to tackle prob-

lems I've solved before but also to apply previously unsuccessful solutions to similar dilemmas when they arise anew.

"They" haunt me. They won't let me. They make me. They won't like it. They'll love it. The list of ways "they" color my decisions is endless. Is my reliance on their conclusions a convenient way for me to disengage myself from an uncomfortable or unpredictable situation?

I see the negative more than I see the positive. Each time I see something that is wrong I label it "problem" and try to correct it. That's as it should be. What I neglect to do is to see what is working and label it "opportunity," an idea to be exploited, extended, or adapted. What if instead of an absence report telling us who is not at school and why, we asked teachers to send us a presence report stating who is here and what is being done for each student? What if we broadened the concept of "school without failure" to include the staff? Can we design an organization in which each faculty member is working in his area of greatest strength and spends little or no time on those activities in which he is weakest?[4]

Each of these five school heads is moving into quite a different set of meanings and possible procedures in "evaluation" from those the other four have in mind. It may be that quite different strategies, each called "evaluation," will follow each of these statements. There's plenty of argument right now among searching, intelligent heads of public and independent schools on whether the kind of evaluation strategies they want can be tied to salary decisions or firing decisions at all, or on whether teacher-evaluation programs are useful for anything other than those two purposes.

Teachers are talking . . .

I think I'm pretty good. I have some ideas of where I'd like to be better. I have taken 60 graduate credits in my field and that's been useful, but that's not where I'm really searching now. If there could be some really professional, colleague-to-colleague exchange—if *that's* what "evaluation" means—then I'm eager for it.

As a department head I am stuck with five teachers, two of them professionally congenial with me, two whose work I know rather little, and one who I think is professionally a kook. I teach nearly a full load and coach a varsity sport. If there were a way we could find the time and the will to get together and really hammer out some plans, share some ideas, make some policies . . .

I have been teaching five months and I'm scared I'm not going to make it. Colleagues—usually running through the cafeteria or bumping into me in the hall—will ask, "How is it going?" and I'll call, "Fine!" after them. I'm not about to tell the head I'm this worried. He's busy and seems to like only good news. I want to make it, and what's saving me, if anything, is the chance to talk a lot with three other beginning teachers I met at a conference. I meet with them

[4]William L. Pharis, "Who, Me?" *The National Elementary Principal*, February 1973, p. 100. Copyright 1973, National Association of Elementary School Principals. All rights reserved.

> when I can, usually late at night over a beer or sometimes on the phone. But they're fairly far away, and they have some troubles that are different from mine. But at least we can give each other some moral support.

(That's the first use of "moral support," which is becoming increasingly vivid and familiar to me in my work in schools. Notice where this fellow has to get it. He may have a sense that there is some program or strategy, though he probably would not call it "evaluation," which could make his situation better, which would help him to "make it."

> We are all of us professionally very lonely here. We know it's a Good School, but nobody ever talks to each other—except in small talk or in procedural stuff at a faculty meeting. There is so much pride in the independent, sacred inviolate thing in each person's classroom that no one wants to risk any sharing. So it's just competitive, with each person's "game" invisible to the others.

Each of the teachers quoted here is reaching for some kind of experience that could come under "evaluation," and each is apprehensive about the negative, judgmental connotations (all too familiar) of the term. What strategies in evaluation could really serve any one of these five teachers and any one of these five heads of schools, or even all of them? And how might some of those strategies really serve the total school out of which any of those people are speaking, very much including the students? This is not a rhetorical question heralding the presentation of an Evaluation Package. It is an honest question any good group of teachers and administrators could use to animate their search for some experiences in evaluation that they can trust and make work for them.

An inside-outside pro is talking. . .

Harold Howe, who has been in and around independent schools, public schools, the national scene, and the foundation world, makes a delightful connection between improving your tennis and improving your teaching. "The only way to learn tennis is to play with someone better than you are who can provide what psychologists call immediate feedback." He goes on to establish the difference between actually working with somebody who is better at it than you are, rather than having endless discussions of the game:

> Tennis demands judgment of the actions of others, a capacity to anticipate, a set of physical skills, and endless practice. You can talk about tennis all you want, seek out tennis players at parties, and pay high prices for seats in the front row at Forest Hills or Wimbledon without improving your tennis game very much, even though you may improve your tennis conversation.
>
> To be sure, teaching takes place within an intellectual context, as tennis does not, and requires a mastery of subject matter and an understanding of the peculiarities of human beings who teach and learn. Teaching also includes, however, a large component of what some call methodology, others call art, and what I regard largely as a complex of skills. These skills are based on the ability

to size up individuals, to judge their responses, and to make your responses reflect theirs, to diagnose each one's special needs and problems, to present ideas and activities in ways that will motivate interest in learning, to coordinate varied materials into their most effective impact, to sense the nuances of individual and group attitudes and feelings, and to balance all these variables in a kaleidoscopic drama featuring players with different rates of learning, different backgrounds, and totally different feelings. [When a faculty gets to looking at criteria for studying teaching skills, that ought to be hanging on the wall in large magic-marker letters! Then, nailing the tennis analogy down:] However valuable the good teacher's academic preparation may have been, he only emerges as a good teacher and comes somewhere near solving his multifaceted problem by getting into a classroom, contending with reality, and getting immediate feedback on his performance from someone more skillful than he is, someone who can tell him how he might perform a given task better, why one activity or another seems more or less productive, and which alternative approaches might yield better results. [Notice the emphasis here on work with a "better partner."][5]

Parents are talking . . .

The *parents* who want evaluation are having more and more to say. Parents often feel totally helpless about school. "I am a taxpayer," or "I am a tuition-payer," are not very strengthening to a parent who feels strongly about the good or neutral or bad experience his child is having in school. Listen to a few parent voices, each again dealing consciously or not with some parts of teacher evaluation.

> I'm sick of waiting around for the school to grow, to get human, to get coherent. While I'm waiting, I think I could be useful to them down there, at least in their dealings with my son and maybe in other ways. But I'm already pegged as a Difficult Parent, and the defenses fly up when they hear my voice or see me, and they seem only to want to pacify me or put me off.

That is a very alert and intelligent woman speaking. How could she be a useful part of some kind of evaluation strategy in the school her son goes to?

> Sixth grade was the best year our daughter has had. It was the culmination of her experience in the Lower School, hers and ours. We felt welcomed at the school, at home there, part of the experience of "school" for our daughter. We had some perspectives on Ellen that they needed, and they certainly had some that we needed. But we learned about the rest of the class, about its journey toward some kind of fellowship and humanity in dealing with each other, and how much the school cared about this journey. We could see our daughter in this setting, saw her grow and develop and affect the setting as it affected her. We know from our own experience (we even got into some kind of marvelous

[5]Harold Howe, II, "Improving Teacher Education through Exposures to Reality," in Donald J. McCarty and associates, *New Perspectives on Teacher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), pp. 54-55.

math, wherever it was in the "new" spectrum) where superb open classroom was. We later experienced a dumb one, and that at least helped us on the open versus traditional business, especially since Ellen had thrived under a teacher people called "traditional" and thrived also under a teacher people called "open classroom," and this past splendid year was with her present totally unclassifiable teacher. But all this was *our* experience, too, and we cherish it.

That is quite a statement about parents' partnership with the child in the school. Surely that school is well along the way to using the perspectives of parents to help the school serve the child, and to help educate the parents to what the school is about. What are some ways the school could capitalize on this?

Molly is home laboring over a student-evaluation-of-a-teacher form which seems to me to omit all the key questions!

That school might learn a thing or two from what this parent thought the key questions were.

My child came alive in Mrs. Marino's class. She seemed to feel "recognized," to be comfortable, to be able to deal with things she cared about and somehow interweave them with the stuff of the course. I told Mrs. Marino this, and she seemed quite bowled over—first, that our daughter was not blooming in this way in other classes, and second, that we were thanking and valuing her as a teacher and person. "It's usually the gripes that get to us," she said. When she was not reappointed for the next year, I was aghast . . .

Mrs. Marino was surprised at the compliment. Decision-makers at the school might also have been surprised at it, but they probably didn't know about it. Whatever went wrong, some useful approach to evaluation might have made it go right.

I think the school has made a decision about the teaching of science that is senseless in relation to what we know now about biology and its relation to chemistry and physics. I'm getting together with the head of the science department and the head of the school tomorrow. They seem wary, but I'm hoping we can talk together, perhaps get a group of scientists who can consult with the school without seeming to lean too hard on them or to be perceived as arrogant. The big hope is the science man's openness to this idea and, to my great pleasure, the head's. They don't seem to feel threatened. We'll see . . .

There is potential in this parent for real service to a school in its effort to examine its strengths and extend them. But a school needs to look at its own parent group as it looks at itself and to work them into the strategies they develop under "evaluation."

Students are talking . . .

The *students* who want evaluation of teachers are heard from intermittently but often eloquently. Their pleas cover a whole range of attitudes from unquiet desperation to enormous appreciation, probably with some indifference in between. Out of the conversations I've had with students from schools around the country in the last year or so, I have picked these fragments that seem to me to be resonant with possible meanings for any school that wants to look at itself with the idea of building on strengths and getting all possible perspectives to do this.

> They say that there are things students don't understand about teaching and curriculum and all, but there's one thing I'm an expert in, and that is what it feels like to be me in the middle of the tenth grade right now. I'd like to tell somebody about it around here.

Is there somebody to hear it? And not in some kind of random way, but with a real, exploratory give-and-take?

> The best experience I ever had at school was sitting on the Religious Life Committee. There were six students, six teachers, the dean, two parents, and one trustee. People really listened to each other and respected each other. And we talked about things that *mattered*, we actually made things happen, made them *better* in the school. But it was more than that: it was the best chance I've had to really *work* with people—adults and kids—on an equal footing, and about things we cared about . . .

The coming together actually happened. To call this a strength in a school is modest indeed. Could this spirit come into classrooms? Faculty meetings? It sounds as if there was something ready-made to spill over into the life of the school. Surely this could be built into actual evaluation strategies without killing the spirit. Quite the contrary.

> I just filled out the student evaluation form on my French teacher, and I really let him have it. Thank God for my anonymous typewriter!

Obviously that school has a program of student evaluation of teachers going. It sounds as if a good deal has been left out in trying to build an atmosphere in which it could be really useful. It also sounds as if this student has never really talked with the French teacher about how things are going in class. Is a student evaluation form on a teacher the best place to begin such a conversation? The worst? "I really let him have it." Indeed.

> I'd like to know what this course is really supposed to do. I know what *I* am supposed to do, but I don't see *it* adding up to anything. The teacher is a really fine guy. I have a feeling he doesn't know what the course is supposed to do, either, except to get us through the material. But he's making the best of it, and we appreciate that. But there ought to be something more . . .

What a superb beginning to a conversation about teaching and learning, with one teacher and one student at least. Of course I told the student to seek the teacher out and get into a conversation that was comfortable and human and allowed this concern to come up. He looked doubtful. There seemed to be no way open to do that easily. Could one be found?

> All the important experiences I've ever had in my whole life have been outside of school. Look how much time and effort I've put into school. They really don't *know* me there!

That student, all these students, even the one working angrily on his typewriter, could be part of an evaluation process that serves them and their teachers' arts and skills as well.

First the whole faculty WE and the WE's within the faculty

If the school's faculty really wants to build on its strengths, surely an appropriate approach to evaluation is to focus on "we" and not just "me," "him," or "her." There are a number of "we's" within a faculty, not even to mention the "we's" within a total school. A division of a school (grades 1-2-3, say, or the middle school), or a subject-matter group, is an obvious "we." The two fourth-grade teachers, however similar or different in their styles, are a "we" that is obvious, yet it's surprising how often they remain walled off from each other. Beginning teachers, or those new to the school but with some teaching elsewhere, or men and women with ten or more years' perspective on the particular school, or experienced pros in their forties and fifties and sixties, sometimes relegated to the sidelines, sometimes as Rocks of Gibraltar, sometimes as obstructionist stone walls—each of these groups is a natural "we" whose partnership in evaluation could be productive, illuminating, and even congenial. Fixed ideologists—the Militant Open Classroomers or Traditionalists—so often too neatly classified to soar as their best professional selves, are each an all too familiar locked-in "we."

But there are other "we's" that could make new partnerships in a school, "we's" that may not come together so naturally. I know an upper-school mathematics teacher who has delightfully opened up his own career's adventure since he started working part-time in the lower school with a second-grade teacher and a fourth-grade teacher, who in turn have moved into a whole new confidence and enthusiasm in mathematics. I know a Latin teacher in his twenties who went on a school-choir weekend retreat headed by a superb musician in her sixties, and there began a professional "we" of mutual learning as well as respect. These less obvious "we's" happen rarely by happy accident. There needs to be some planned effort, some reason for them to come together, out of their separate busy-ness in the school. *Time* needs to be made for this, as well as a reason. What better reason than to approach evaluation by having the school's faculty ask, "What are our strengths, and how can we develop them?"

I heard recently of a development from one "we" to several others that comes at the whole evaluation idea so differently from the one-visit-a-year-to-fill-out the checklist approach. I was in the middle of a searching conversation led by Fred Peterson, of Phillips Academy, and Peter Gunness, of Buckingham Browne and Nichols School, at a seminar on teacher evaluation, one of several that these two experienced pros have led under the sponsorship of the Independent Schools Association of Massachusetts.[6] The day seemed to me wonderfully helpful. There were no packages or preaching, plenty of searching questions, and respectful and generous sharing of ideas and experiences.

Somewhere around the middle of this day, Brian Walsh, head of the Shore Country Day School, briefly described a kind of "journey" for beginning teachers who are starting their careers in his school. I have thought about it a good deal since then and have built a number of good fantasies on it, fantasies I think have solid value for any school dealing with teacher evaluation through a new look at the "we's" in the school. The beginning teachers met with Mr. Walsh before school started for some sharing, planning, and morale-building. After school got under way, they met in regularly scheduled, planned sessions. Early in November, when they were beginning to get a sense of other faculty members, they started informally to scout special strengths in some of their more experienced colleagues, strengths they felt they wanted to look at, to learn from. They got some clues where to look, of course, from Mr. Walsh, who knew some of these strengths and could point to them right away (surely one of the head's own most convenient strengths). But the beginners also got their news from grapevines, cafeteria conversations, students, colleagues, and school folklore as well as from their own observations.

Imagine for a moment just what this could lead to in a school, the kind of process Mr. Walsh described (he did not go into specific teachers or specific skills). Imagine, say, a Mr. Brook, who is particularly skilled at getting productive discussion going. Let's say Mrs. Couloris is good at getting difficult concepts across in a number of different ways, so that students having different learning styles can come at a concept in one way, if not in another. Mr. Hoy may be skilled in making students feel they are taken seriously, so that they respond with maturity and caring in his class. Mr. McNaught organizes material with special inventiveness. Perhaps Miss Kruze presents new material in powerful ways, in illuminating lectures, with no apologies for lecturing and no troubles with long-windedness. There might be a Mr. Roth who runs an open-classroom fifth grade with special vitality and imaginativeness, and a Miss Garvin who has a remarkable track record in teaching Spanish to people who supposedly Can't Do Languages.

[6]See Frederick A. Peterson, *Teacher Evaluation in the Independent School*, published in October 1974 by the Independent School Association of Massachusetts, 23 School St., Andover, Mass. 01810.

This may sound like some kind of ideal faculty, but surely most of these strengths, and many, many others, exist in many good school faculties. These strengths may be associated with assorted weaknesses in the work of any or all of these teachers. But weaknesses are not what these beginning teachers were looking for. They got into conversations with the teachers whose work interested them, conversations quite independent of who was teaching what subject and what age student. They started visiting classes and followed up with more talk, small-group meetings, return visits, and visits by the experienced pros to the beginners' classrooms. There developed what could reasonably be called a process of evaluation involving a large number (not all) of the teachers in the school. Again, time had to be made. (Mr. Walsh, for one, was doing a formidable amount of substituting in a lot of classes while this was going on!) New teachers and old pros were working together, helping—and enjoying—one another across subjects and divisions, ages, and styles. The isolated and awed "we" of the teachers who were starting their careers moved into a number of quite different "we's" as these associations began. The whole process was based on identifying strengths and moving ahead with them.

Then the ME among the faculty

Surely an appropriate part of a faculty's examination of its strengths is the individual teacher's or division administrator's or head's seeking out *his own* strengths and ways to develop them. It is easy to say any of us does this all the time, automatically, in our work, but it may be that we don't, actually. We get busy. The bell rings. A new class comes in. There are two committees meeting after school, and the seventh-grade parents' evening starts at eight o'clock, and there is a packet of papers in a folder on the desk—*and* there is a life going on at home, too, and we're in it.

A lot of the time if we're not locked into being busy we're locked into feeling guilty, or we are both busy *and* guilty, which is more usual. Some of the finest teachers and school heads I know have so much conscience about what they are *not* doing, the people they are *not* helping, the new ideas they are *not* hearing or reading about or trying out, that they sometimes lose sight of their strengths, the qualities and skills that give them their own professional style and quality and excellence, that could take them on into a more fulfilling and contributing experience in their careers.

Parallel to a school's search into its strengths and where it wants to go with them, the individual faculty member's own search into *his* strengths and how to build on them, into his sense of his own professional journey, needs to be more explicit, with more time to explore, enjoy, and grow. Easily said. *Everybody* needs to provide for this process: boards of trustees, administrators, the schedule-makers and the programmers of the computer, department heads, the individual faculty member. Again, we are talking

about consciously designed times and strategies, not exhortations for professional growing, which is supposed to happen during Thanksgiving and Christmas recesses or in summer courses. (I know some teachers so committed to subject-matter updating in extension and summer courses that they are far less able to examine their own strengths and plan for the best use of them than they would be if they weren't being so dogged in what they insist is the only "real" professional growing.) This is not to put down course-taking but to stress the value of stocktaking.

I am assuming here a very different approach to teacher evaluation from the stereotyped and awesome annual visit with the clipboard. We need an appropriate set of symbols—and experiences—worth considering in answer to Harold Armstrong's nice opener on style and intent in performance evaluation: "If you were asked to select a symbol to represent teacher evaluation, what would it be? A yardstick? Guillotine? Stethoscope? Peeping Tom? Final Examination? Psychiatrist's Couch?"[7]

Think about the possible symbols that rise in a school, if only as warnings against or inspirations for the kind of spirit that can develop in the experience of evaluation. Without getting either heavily literary or psychological about it, it might be interesting for a school to develop its own set of symbols or images or visual equivalents of the spirit they would like to "represent" or evoke in their process of evaluating individual strengths, in their exploration, each teacher, of "What are my strengths and how can I develop them?"

[7]Harold R. Armstrong, "Performance Evaluation," *The National Elementary Principal*, February 1973, p. 51. Mr. Armstrong is president of the School Management Institute, Inc., in Worthington, Ohio, and is author of *A Teacher's Guide to Teaching Performance Evaluation*, published in 1972 by the School Management Institute, Inc.

2

Steps toward a Good Evaluation in a School

The faculty commits itself to exploring evaluation for teachers and administrators

The commitment at least to explore the subject needs to be made in the spirit of "What are *our* strengths . . ." first and "What are *my* strengths . . ." next. And the exploring must be real. (The school head who moves into his colleagues and announces that there's going to be an evaluation program for himself and the teachers, and then asks the group to set about devising a system for doing this, is probably only one step in advance of the head who announces that there will be an evaluation program and then presents the complete, packaged "system" that will be used. But it's a rather small step in advance.)

"What are our strengths . . ." invites a faculty to search, to work together discovering ideas and practices and styles from one another. Thus they can move forward as a faculty and as individuals to more strengths, more growth, more enjoyment of and pride in an expanding and deepening excellence. We have happily come a long way in school talk from the time when the "pursuit of excellence" tended to mean that students were being made to work compulsively hard to get the answers right and to feel terrible, presumably unexcellent, if those answers weren't right. "Excellence," if the word still has some charge of general meaning amidst educational rhetoric, is a nice term to which an astute faculty can apply specific "experience meanings" in exploring goals and their own strengths and ambitions. I say "experience meanings" as opposed to other words as abstract as "excellence," which are passed off as a definition without indications of *how*. It is surely more helpful to work with a beginning like "Excellence is when . . ." or "The kinds of excellence we are talking about now relate to . . ."

So there is a faculty commitment to explore in the first place. Who will do the exploring? Theoretically, everybody will, but there will need to be some people on the faculty who are willing to make some kind of reasonably systematic study, not a lifework but a searching study, of attitudes and resources within the school and of the experience of teacher evaluation as it has been practiced, struggled over, tried out, rejected, affirmed, in the last

fifty years or so, outside of the school. I have heard heads of schools say they are developing their school's approach to evaluation within their own administrative team. Others I'm hearing talk about evaluation in seminars and conferences recommend a volunteer committee of caring people who agree to pursue the topic and keep reporting back and developing their recommendations with their colleagues. Other schools may have an existing group or body that can simply move into this task. But there have to be some people who will really do the homework and keep the rest of their colleagues informed along the way.

The committee is the center of the developing evaluation process but keeps connected with the rest of the faculty

That group of people gathered to "do the homework" needs to include a range of attitudes, experiences, subject fields, ages, lengths of service, "roles" in the school, and styles of teaching. One head of a school I talked with spoke up very vigorously for this need and added, "That's the way to do it and the way I'm beginning it this fall. But I'm going to be damned sure I'm in a pretty steady conversation with the committee, especially when they're talking about criteria. This isn't something a head farms out."

How this committee keeps its connections with the rest of the school community is crucial. It's easy to imagine ways this process could go wrong, and we have all heard of sad examples. The committee, say, can become very sophisticated about dissertations on teacher evaluation and about descriptions of school practices in professional journals. It moves ahead to develop detailed criteria and procedures and has a superb experience of cooperation and professional partnership. When the members are "finished," they present a completed package: a whole set of procedures and strategies ready to be instituted in the school. The head of the school, who introduces the final report, blesses the committee, and shares in the partnership and the program that has emerged, is delighted with it all, and, at the end of the report, he joins the committee in awaiting the applause and cheering.

The applause and cheering just might not come. Why not? Does anyone need even to point out here that the committee did all the work, fought through all the issues, stated its hopes, designed the process, while the rest of the faculty (even setting aside, for now, the parents, students and board) is outside, uninvolved, having it all done not only *for* them but *to* them! Add to this the head of the school's participation and evident approval and you have a perfect setup for the kind of ingroup-outgroup we-they polarization that often can sear a fine, well-meaning, and professional faculty.

There are other potential troubles that can follow the presentation of some kind of final package. The evaluation committee, its efforts "finished"

and its "product" ready to be implemented, gradually slips into being a kind of minute-man group for assessing how things are in the school, or it is perceived that way. Once that has happened, the whole spirit of "what are our strengths . . ." and "What are my strengths . . ."—of faculty partnership and sharing—is lost. What remains is a system devised and put over by its enthusiasts on top of "the others."

That sad result can come from a beginning that seems so carefully right, from a process that is so valuable to the committee members. The actual plans for evaluation that emerge might really be potentially useful and appropriate to that school, yet the inside-outside split, the us-them polarizing, can sabotage all the values and potential of the plans.

All a long way of setting up this plea: whoever is on the committee to develop a school's approach to teacher evaluation, and however intensely they do their research in and beyond the school, *the committee should keep related to the rest of the faculty as the study goes on, right from the start.* This can be furthered by special groups, planning subcommittees, informal conversations joining colleagues supposedly apathetic or hostile to the evaluation study, sections of faculty meetings that deal with specific threads in the study—experiences that involve *every* faculty member at some point or other along the way. Then, when some kind of preliminary study is ready to be examined by the whole faculty, not only will the process be "ours," rather than some ingroup's, but many of the values of exploring, working together, and developing professional partnerships will already be evident, will have begun to work, and be in some way a part of *everybody's* experience. This may sound idyllic, or at least naive, but it is a goal worth taking seriously.

Criteria for US as a faculty

For the faculty search for "our" strengths and where to go with them, and for the individual teacher's own search, working out criteria could be the most illuminating part of the whole evaluation venture. What a school faculty really cares about and what it does with that caring is at the center of the "we" part of evaluation. Sometimes a faculty searches out its own priorities, carings, and goals only when confronted with an outside test, such as a regional accrediting whose time has come round. This can be a wonderfully useful process or it can be simply a word game in which highly abstract statements are settled on by the faculty or by committees, words that are broad enough to cover all the views and styles in the faculty and philosophically impressive enough to be taken seriously within a school and by the accreditors from outside.

In a school's own search of "our" strengths, people need to decide how they *wish* they were strong as well as how they *are* strong. Given the hours of procedural organizational stuff that fill so many faculty meetings around the country in an academic year, what a splendid focus can be hammering

out the faculty's criteria for strength, its priorities, its aspirations, which stand, on good days and even bad days, as inspiration, encouragement, and challenge. Hammering out the criteria for "us" can take a faculty into endless reading, seminars, studies, and exploration individually, together, and outside of the school.

Obviously "endless" reading isn't possible, but it is worth trying for a balance between getting others' ideas and experiences from, say, Plato to Lawrence Cremin,[1] Shakespeare to John Holt,[2] Whitehead[3] to Douglas Heath[4]—and arriving at "what we care about." A serious search into "where our hearts lie" can give a faculty some criteria it believes in and a professional adventure it can find enormously enriching as its members set about looking at their own, as well as at the whole faculty's, strengths, aspirations, and achievements in relation to those criteria.

Criteria for ME as a teacher

If a faculty is really engaged in an evaluation venture based on capitalizing on strengths and on moving to more strength, it may be that evaluations of individual teachers are going to be made according to a great variety of criteria. Any criteria for "me" had better start with where "I" think I am strong, what I value, where I think I should be heading.

Some teachers may do best to start by themselves, with a piece of blank paper, rather than with the most sophisticated questionnaire. Others may prefer to work with two quite different teacher-evaluation forms that they come on that reflect at least some different biases and emphases. Filling out an evaluation sheet on one's own teaching can and should be helpful to the teacher's developing sense of the criteria he takes most seriously. It can also be a way of *not* wrestling with the crucial questions of one's own aims, standards, expectations, and hopes in one's work as a teacher. I would urge inviting as many teachers as are willing and interested to make some kind of commitment in writing on "what I aspire to do well as a teacher," or "what I aim to achieve in my work here" or "criteria for my look at my own performance," or however a teacher wants to come at the self-evaluation process.

This sounds like a rather random, do-your-own-thing approach to self-evaluation, but it can lead to some useful next steps in a school. Think of the potential for widening vision, for professional conversation, in the sharing by even two colleagues of the criteria each has noted for himself—a sec-

[1]Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York: Knopf, 1961).
[2]John Holt, *How Children Fail* (New York: Pitman, 1964), and see his subsequent books.
[3]Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1929).
[4]Douglas Heath, *Humanizing Schools: New Directions, New Decisions* (Rochelle Park, N.J.: Hayden, 1971).

ond-grade classroom teacher and a senior high school mathematics teacher, say, or the head of the school and a middle-school history teacher of three months' experience, or the head of the physical education department and the choral director! These are sample pairings of people who might find each other's criteria at least interesting and worth discussing before they go any farther into self-evaluation.

How about combinations of three or four? An academic department? A twenty-f[illegible]e-year teacher, a ten-year teacher, and a three-year teacher? A teach[illegible]d his class? Just think of the usefulness of a teacher's own stated crite[illegible]a as a basis for exploring with his students. It could lead into students' own criteria for their own work in a course or for a year. That kind of sharing could develop some mutual awareness and understanding of purposes and hopes that could make an extraordinary difference in a class's—a school's—learning atmosphere.

Thus these individual approaches to criteria could be crucial to a teacher's self-evaluation, to a developing professional colleagueship among teachers, to a sharing of understanding among people with different "roles" in the school, to teacher-student relationships and understandings, not even to mention the coming together of teachers and parents and teachers and board members. And remember we are talking now about *individual* teachers' criteria, shared with a few other people.

Some school faculties might move from these individual criteria to making some kind of general criteria that could be useful to the whole faculty, and even, not to sound too grandiose, to the teaching profession itself. Some might not. A faculty committee exploring evaluation should surely not feel it has to come up with or shop around for some final instrument that will Do the Job for every teacher's self-evaluation or colleague evaluation or any other kind. If it does come up with a general set of criteria that the faculty is willing to work with and that teachers will try out in self-evaluation, that set of criteria still need to be joined by a teacher's own personal-professional "criteria for me" to be useful to him and to the whole process of evaluation in the school.

Colleague-observers

"It is difficult to find anyone, professional educator or layman, who does not think he, at least, can recognize good teaching when he sees it. No policy is more widely believed than the one which says it is possible to judge a teacher's skill by watching him teach."[5] The annual classroom visitor,

[5]Harold J. McNally, "What Makes a Good Evaluation Program," *The National Elementary Principal*, February 1973, pp. 25-29, is an illuminating article in which the author cites D. M. Medley and H. E. Mitzell, "Measuring Classroom Behavior by Systematic Observation," in Nathaniel L. Gage, *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963).

usually an administrator, clipboard in hand, busily writing and then quickly disappearing, his enigmatic face headed in another direction, is a recurring nightmare image in the literature, experience, and mythology of teacher evaluation. The legend has grown out of actual experiences in many cases: the principal who falls spectacularly asleep in the class and then writes "a poor evaluation"; the department head who visits at contract time, seeking "evidence" to support his already formed opinion; the critic-teacher who doesn't share (or even know) the aims of the person teaching the class—the aims for the day, for the unit, or for the year.

The process and the spirit I see developing in teacher evaluation suggests something very different. For a faculty going through its "what are our strengths" process, one would hope that any classroom visitor (1) would already be in some kind of partnership with the teacher in the evaluation experience; (2) would have already discussed with the teacher both his own "criteria for me" and his aims for that particular class; (3) would be watching and listening to the *whole* process—students' words, faces, motions, the material of the lesson itself, the activities and strategies chosen, the relationships in the room, the atmosphere and all the rest—and not just the teacher's words, voice, and gestures; and (4) would follow up *on the same day* with even a few minutes of conversation to share perspectives on what the visitor and the teacher each thought was happening or on what one or the other questioned or needed to explore together.

The automatic ceremonial visit of the head of the school, the division head, or the department head needn't be the only classroom visit, nor need it be forbidding or just ceremonial. These administrators are as much colleagues as a fellow mathematics or third-grade teacher, with questions, aims, strengths, and concerns of their own. The department colleague or someone in a totally different field or part of the school can bring a useful, supporting, even illuminating, experience in the kind of give-and-take that can result from one or more classroom visits. ("In relation to what you really wanted to happen today, how did you feel about the last ten minutes of the class?" "How did you come to choose those readings?" "Was Joe putting down Harry, or is that just his style?" "What did you feel best about during the class?" "Did anything during the class disappoint you?" "What do you have in mind for the next three days? What is your best hope for what will happen during those next three days?" "What were some classes like in this course with these same students that went very differently from this one?" "Which kids do you think left feeling really good about themselves and what they had done in here?") Any of these or a thousand other sympathetic and searching professional questions can be a useful beginning to a conversation, a mutually helpful and interesting professional exchange after a classroom visit. The visitor's different (or similar) criteria, carings, aims, assumptions can be an illuminating part of the conversation, rather than having him pretend some kind of objectivity and omniscience.

If there is some document the visitor holds in his hand (the teacher's own criteria or notes or plans, the faculty's agreed-on general evaluation instrument—if there is one—or a form borrowed from somewhere that seems to have some usefulness), it can be the source of a good conversation after the visit. But I would urge that the document, if any, *never* be filled out and mysteriously filed or used somehow without the teacher's seeing it. The whole spirit of the kind of partnership and growth being described here could so easily be sabotaged by a rate-scale-classify-file-and-hide approach to classroom observing. Ideally—and surely this is not such a naive hope—the visit should be interesting and productive for the teacher and the visitor, with new and old questions raised, different perspectives compared, new possibilities opened, strengths affirmed, and—why not?—a new dimension or two of mutual compassion and respect. If anything like that happens, then the four or five days out of the hundred and eighty that a colleague might visit a teacher's class (and couldn't the number of days be a lot higher for those who would like it?) could really matter to a teacher and to the faculty's sense of its own professional journey together.

Trying out a range of instruments

One way to make a school's experience in evaluation an exploratory and professional venture is to try out a whole range of what look to be interesting instruments, forms, strategies, approaches, ways of examining and studying teaching and learning. This is *not* a substitute for a faculty's and individuals' hammering out criteria. But it can allow a kind of exploring that the all-out commitment to one instrument or approach prevents. It can also help avoid the sense of An Evaluation System that is being "installed" to "process" people. There are almost endless numbers of instruments, forms, and schemes.

Here are notes on a few that involve various kinds of self-searching for individuals and for a total school. They are not just for browsing. Some look rather formidable in the time they take, their intricacy, their cost, their demands on those using them. So much the better. (You would not have read this far if you weren't farther into the teacher-evaluation question than a search for browsing materials.)

A reminder: an instrument can be fine, but it is no good without intelligent use and a setting for its use that includes trust and some courage and generosity. Most of all, good use of a good instrument implies that those using it are willing, even eager, to see "where they are" in relation to the terms of the instrument, to learn something, even discrepancies between "I mean" and "I do," and to do something about what they learn.

1. Leslie J. Wehling and W. W. Charters, Jr., "Dimensions of Teacher Beliefs about the Teaching Process," *The American Educational Research Journal*, January 1969. At the end of the article is a provocative questionnaire on eight

separate dimensions of this topic plus eleven useful references.

2. "Classroom Environment Index," by Stern and Walker, is useful for students and/or teachers to work out. It makes available a wide range of interpretive material and data. A full discussion of the instrument can be found in G. G. Stern, *People in Context* (New York: Wiley, 1970). The instrument itself is available from the Psychological Research Center, 250 Machinery Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. 13210.

3. "High School Characteristics Index," by Stern, is intended for students. It is also available from Syracuse University (see item 2, above).

4. Don't miss out on Edmund J. Amidon's materials on "Interaction Analysis." Some will resist the careful stopwatch timing and the effort to classify the things going on in the classroom almost second by second, but the results can be a revelation to a teacher. There are no simple conclusions, like "55 per cent lecture, oops, bad!" or "55 per cent discussion, ah, good!" The instruments are searching and detailed. Parts are ideal to do alone. Others work best with a colleague recording, holding the instrument during the class, and then having the teacher and the visitor go over it together afterwards—and then reversing roles the next period. The materials are available from Dr. Amidon's office at Temple University, Broad and Montgomery Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 19122.

5. "Conflict Management Survey," by Jay Hall, surveys one's characteristic reactions to and handling of conflicts between himself and others. A fascinating instrument, it would be a major production if a faculty were to use it. The process is an education in itself in approaches to getting information on individual and institutional commitments and behaviors. The instrument is interesting for so many different perspectives: individual teachers can "locate themselves on certain attitudes and styles, then can do the rating what a person thinks "the others" or "the school" would say, or what "the students" would say. Then the different groups can compare what they actually did say. This instrument, and information on a whole range of other provocative and view-expanding instruments and approaches, are available from Teleometrics, P.O. Drawer 1850, Conroe, Tex. 77301.

See also the references and sources in the thirteen items listed in Exhibit I, below.

A special plea for imaginative use of the video-tape machine

Video tape is in itself another potentially illuminating "instrument." Some make great claims for its usefulness in self-evaluation and in process evaluation. Some take fright, imagining the machine's eye peering at warts, gaucheries, and goofs. Still others refuse to consider video tape because it is mechanical, and that means it is either a problem to work or it smacks of Orwellian technology. Let those who are curious try it out and see what they find for themselves and what they might share with others about its usefulness. I would make these suggestions for any trying out of video tape in evaluation.

In the classroom, get a colleague or a student who is not part of the class (so that the whole class can be in action) to aim the video camera around the room, during a given period, at groups of students, at individuals as they listen or talk (or do *not* listen or talk), at the teacher when he is listening or talking or neither. The camera does not need to run all period, but it can. After class, the tape can be enormously useful. There's much more there than "Look at that blotch on my cheek," or "My tie wasn't straight." The teacher can see and hear a process, the people in it, faces, fragments of comments, body positions, and asides he may have missed during the actual class. He can watch how students respond to each other, if they do, or how they learn from one another, put each other down, build some idea or coherence together, support one another, split off from one another or from the coherence of the lesson. He can get a sense from those faces, bodies, and voices of who is "getting it" and what it is they are getting.

If not hypnotized by "How am I looking?" the teacher can watch his own part in the process, the kind of questions he raises, how he enters or withdraws at certain times, how he supports or shoots down students' efforts to join in, learn, share, and trust, or their efforts to evade, withdraw, and reject, if there's some of that going on. A teacher can put himself in the student's place, as he watches the tape, in a way that is hard to do when the class is happening and he is the teacher. And he can watch his own teaching almost as a professional colleague, a congenial critic: "Did *I* say that?" "*There* was a good chance to move into the central idea." "Joe was totally out of it and that comment put him still further out of it." "Meg really expressed the main point and I missed it!" "Good!" "Oops!"

In a particularly clear way, a teacher can see the intellectual design, the coherence (or the fuzziness or the absence of design and coherence) in the class period: "Were we moving anywhere?" "Did this explanation hook on to that?" "Did Harry and Joan see the design that I had in mind?" "Did I see the design that *they* had in mind?" "What did the class period *do* for the whole unit, or even the whole course?" The teacher can take those criteria he has written for himself, look at his course as it is developing, and then connect these with the actual processes he sees and hears on the tape. He might even line up whatever the school has drafted about its own general criteria and examine it in relation to what he sees on the tape.

All this simply suggests a few ways a teacher could look at a piece of video tape on his own class, all by himself, and make that into a useful experience. A parallel experience with a colleague can be useful. Imagine an experienced pro's sitting down with a very new teacher, both watching the tape of *the pro's* class, with the pro commenting and responding as he watches and the new teacher joining with his own observations and questions. Must we always assume that the inexperienced or shaky teacher is the only one who can gain from any evaluation experience? Or that the experienced pro is always the critic-helper-interpreter-improver-challenger? Surely the experienced pro may be the most astute—and tough—critic-helper in

relation to his own work, and the new teacher the most helped by watching and participating in the pro's efforts to become more of a pro himself.

Other colleague combinations might be useful, again including the ones less obvious than the department chairman or the division administrator working with "just a teacher." And I would urge that always *the central person doing the interpreting and analyzing and searching and carrying the conversation should be the teacher himself.* The colleague's usefulness can be in raising helpful questions, pointing to something he has noticed that the teacher has not, helping the teacher move along his own observing and questioning. Most of all, the colleague can help provide—here it comes again—moral support, and some of the solidity and backing and trust that help the teacher have the confidence and the courage to see and enjoy the strength he observes and to deal with the qualities, strategies, styles, and perceptions which he wishes were evident on the tape and to which he aspires.

Perhaps the crucial value of the tape is in providing a way for a class and a teacher to look at how *we* are doing, what is working well and what isn't in *our*—the students' and the teacher's—efforts. What kind of partnership, if any, shows up as we watch the tape? A partnership among some students? Among all the students? Among the students and teacher? Who is doing most of the work? Where is the energy coming from? Who is dominating or withdrawing, contributing or sabotaging? What have we (this class and this teacher) got going for us? How can *we* do any better?

What a different approach to student evaluation of teachers this would be than the detached fourth- or eighth- or twelfth-grade critic's filling out a form rating his teacher in a number of categories and simply handing it in, to the pleasure or dismay of the teacher or whoever is going to read it! It is the emphasis on how-are-*we*-doing, students and teacher, with the strengths in our partnership, how can we do better, that I feel is crucial to any planning in a school's getting into the whole question of student evaluation of teachers.

Student evaluation of teachers

Fantasies, bull sessions out of school, and wishful thinking abound on this subject. There are also actual student-evaluation-of-teachers processes in some schools and more colleges. Eagerness for student evaluation of teachers seemed to explode among college students in the late 1960's, and formulas, rating sheets, course descriptions, and handbooks for the new student were hammered out (and sometimes used like hammers) as part of a wider movement that sought more participation by students in their education. At its best, this effort by students sought a better partnership and understanding among students and teachers. At its worst, it expressed a need and found a way for students to Get Back at Teachers.

The familiar plea for "a chance to have our say" on the part of students

has brought about some efforts in student evaluation of teachers in a few schools. I would guess that these are schools where there is considerable curiosity and hospitality and openness among the faculty and thoughtfulness and seriousness and good will among the students on the whole subject of student evaluation of teachers. On the whole, I have found much less news about student evaluation of teachers in what I've read or seen than evidence of processes of self-evaluation, colleague evaluation, administrator-teacher evaluation, and so on.

Some teachers and administrators find it scary. It is easy to fall into "*We* are professionals and *they*"—"we" and "they" again—"are not qualified to discuss professional matters." Fair enough. We have also heard and said that when the issue of student participation in curriculum and administrative committees came up and once seemed so surprising, even alarming to some.

But what students can uniquely give, and it is surely crucial to any effort to examine the strengths of a faculty and of an individual teacher and to see how to extend them, is this: they can give a sense of what it feels like to be themselves, in the middle of the third-grade class, or the tenth-grade class, or a student-faculty planning committee. A student who says a French teacher should use the X text instead of the Y text may have done a lot or a little or no studying of French texts. His statement is probably worth pursuing mainly because it surely is pointing to some topic other than texts. But a student who says he is overpowered with homework in Mr. Martin's class, or one who says he feels more competent and better about himself in Mrs. Kurry's class than anywhere else, or one who says the explanations are not adequate for him, or are too slow for him, or that the attitudes and behavior of the other students in the class are disruptive to him, or inspiring to him—such students have a kind of information that teachers really need in order to know how they are doing.

There are assorted student-evaluation-of-teacher instruments around, and I am including one here. Most schools that get into this at all will probably want to develop their own, but they have a good deal to gain by looking at and trying out a few others. It might be interesting to have several teachers who are willing and interested try out several different instruments. As for preparing an instrument, obviously students are needed for the job. The experience of being on a small student-faculty committee to draft the instrument that follows was, for a student I talked with, one of the most significant and illuminating experiences he has had in school.

I am including the following instrument, prepared by a group of students and teachers at Germantown Friends School, in Philadelphia, from questionnaires used at a number of schools and colleges, simply as a sample of one way one school moved into this whole area. The school is now in the process of changing the instrument and thinking about how to use it as it looks to its second year of exploration in this area. They have good and bad reports of its usefulness and are moving ahead to satisfy themselves better,

students and faculty alike. A lot depends on the way a given teacher and a set of students see and use the instrument. From this school's experience, and that of a few others I know about, I have developed some concerns, hopes, admonitions, and suggestions and will note them following the instrument itself. Any reader may raise valid questions whether there should be such an instrument at all, whether every teacher's class should fill it out, who should read the completed forms, and what use should be made of them. This is simply a sample to get the conversation going in a school, or in the mind of a teacher or administrator or student, on the subject of student evaluation of teachers.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF COURSE AND TEACHER

Course_____ Teacher_____ Date_____

BEFORE ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, THINK about your attitude toward the material. Are you interested in the subject or do you consider it dull? Also, do your grades influence your opinion of the teacher? It is mandatory, if you wish your answer to be considered, to write a specific comment for any question which you scale 4 or 5. Rate the teacher and/or course by referring to the key and writing the appropriate number [on the line] provided for each question. When evaluating some courses, especially minors such as art, music, physical education, etc., you may find that some of the questions listed here are inappropriate. Use your own judgment to decide which questions do or do not apply for a particular course.

Key: 1 = Always; 2 = Usually; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Seldom; 5 = Never

1) Does the teacher seem enthusiastic about the subject?_____
   Comments:

2) Is the teacher available when you need help?_____
   Comments:

3) Does the teacher explain the material clearly?_____
   Comments:

4) Is the teacher organized and well-prepared for class?_____
   Comments:

5) Does the teacher seem to have an adequate knowledge of the subject?_____
   Comments:

6) Does the teacher treat the students fairly?_____
   Comments:

7) Is the teacher able to maintain a reasonable level of order and an atmosphere conducive to learning?_____
   Comments:

8) Does the teacher meet classes regularly?_____
Comments:

9) Is the teacher on time for classes?_____
Comments:

10) Does the teacher show an interest in your progress and success with the course?
Comments: _____

11) Does the teacher respect the students?_____
Comments:

12) Do the students respect each other?_____
Comments:

13) Is the teacher respected?_____
Comments:

14) Are deadlines enforced fairly?_____
Comments:

15) Is the workload (tests, papers, homework) distributed evenly throughout the marking period?_____
Comments:

16) Are tests and papers returned to the student within a reasonable amount of time?_____
Comments:

17) Have the students been willing to give the teacher a fair chance?_____
Comments:

18) Do they cut?_____

19) Are they on time?_____

20) Do the students participate in class?_____
Comments:

21) Do the students come to class prepared?_____
Comments:

22) Does the homework help you learn the subject?_____
Comments:

23) Is the class flexible enough to allow for unplanned questions which occur in class?_____
Comments:

On the following questions, circle the number which you feel completes the statement most accurately.

24) Is it clear what the goals of the course are? Completely / Somewhat / Not at all
1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

25) The tests in this course have been
Too hard / Challenging but fair / Adequate / Too easy
1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

26) The teacher's grading practices were Fair / Unclear / Unfair
1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

27) The rate of covering material was Too fast / Satisfactory / Too slow
1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

28) List any strong points about the course and the instructor that you would like to mention:

29) List any material which you feel should be modified or replaced:

30) List any weak points about the course and the instructor and your suggestions for improvement:

31) Would you be pleased to have this teacher again? Yes_____ No_____
If no, explain:

32) Would you recommend this course to a friend? Yes_____ No_____
If no, explain:

At this particular school, a class's questionnaire, without student names, went to its teacher, who discussed the collected responses with the students in the class. I have heard others suggest that the questionnaires be seen only by department heads or division administrators or the head of the school. There is plenty to say about that, a lot of it very unfavorable. (Northfield Mount Hermon School's approach to who sees the questionnaires is interesting, and is described in Exhibit III.) I would urge the less murk and mystery, the less wondering about what is being said and written that a teacher is not seeing, the better.

The most astute and sophisticated student-evaluation-of-teachers instrument in the world could be virulent poison in a school where the atmosphere, the assumptions, and the habits were not in some kind of harmony with the instrument, or even with the idea of using one. That is not to say some simplistic thing like Authoritarian, Uptight Schools Should Stay Away from Student-Evaluation-of-Teachers Instruments. That kind of easy dogmatism and classification has been hurtful and stupid in a lot of the educational talk of the past several years.

What kinds of teacher-student relationships, communication, partnership exist in a particular class? In a particular school, if generalizing is possible? Is teaching something that teachers "do to" students, in the way that in some places evaluation is something administrators "do to" teachers, or boards "do to" heads? What can a school do to develop better back-and-forth communication on how things are going between students and teachers? How generous are students in the school in considering the motives, aims, strategies, and styles of their teachers? How generous are teachers in seeing those of students? Such questions can begin some appropriate searching in a school.

I think such questions, and a school's and an individual teacher's efforts in dealing with them, are far more important than developing any kind of student-evaluation-of-teachers instrument. In an atmosphere of sharing and reasonable comfort and trust and nonthreat, an astute student-evaluation-of-teachers instrument can be wonderfully useful as a basis for more of the sharing of perceptions and experiences and ideas between students and teachers, as happened with those planners at Germantown Friends, between student and student and between teacher and teacher. But in such a sharing and trusting atmosphere the instrument can also simply not be needed. The ways might already be open and functioning for students and teachers to share aims and responses and do something constructive as a result of the sharing.

Without at least some of this sharing spirit, student to teacher and teacher to student, the sudden arrival of a packet of evaluation forms can cause students to explode onto the papers a kind of frustration and anger, or a kind of glossing over and hypocrisy, which teachers can find clobbering, frightening, deceiving, or at least confusing. Anonymous explosions met by defensive retaliation is the worst possible result of a student-evaluation-of-teachers process.

If you skipped the video-tape section because your school doesn't have a machine or you don't want to be technological, I urge you to go back and read it for a way of coming at student evaluation of teachers that focuses on how *we*—students and teachers in a given class—are doing, rather than a sudden, unprepared analysis by students of how they think the *teacher* is doing. That is just one of a number of ways.

The partnership of choosing or preparing one or more instruments and building the kind of atmosphere and trust and ongoing communication in which such an instrument can serve students and teachers is certainly a goal worth working toward. In any case, it would seem very strange indeed not to consider the students as part of a school's searching out of its own strengths and how to develop them. It may be that the appropriate searching will in itself help build the morale and atmosphere in which students and teachers are indeed aware and caring partners in the learning—and the living—that goes on in the school.

Exhibit I

Thirteen Key Readings for a Faculty Launching Its Study of Teacher Evaluation

Any even moderately dedicated teacher or administrator who finds himself in a study group to explore evaluation in his school will be overwhelmed by all there is to read about it. The footnotes to one of the twenty good articles I have read, to say nothing of the bibliographies in some of the books, suggest a lifework for the explorer.

There are at least two ways to deal with this enormous amount of information and experience in print. One is to reject it all and "work it out ourselves." This is tempting, and of course a school *does* have to "work it out for ourselves." But surely it is foolish to keep the perspectives so much within the walls that none of the experience, study, trial-and-error—the instruments, ideas, failures and successes and mixtures of others that school people have found and are finding—get into a school's own exploring and shaping its own process of searching out "what are our strengths and how we can develop them." The other way is to start exploring and bog down because some of the reading material seems mechanistic, overorganized, statistical, even pseudo-sociological.

Independent school people are sometimes so sensitive about their credentials as card-carrying humanists that they assume that, whenever anyone wants to count anything, or deal with a questionnaire, or organize information in some kind of manageable way, they are being antihuman. Decades ago some school people used to talk rather disdainfully about "education" and its scholars and writers and researchers in public school systems and teachers' colleges. "The numbers are so great . . ." "The point of view seems so mechanistic . . ." "The situation is so different from ours . . ." and even "The writing style is so dull." Presumably independent schools were Separate from All That. Let's hope we are a long way from that sort of thing by now. We're all in this together; one school, one researcher, one visionary has plenty to share with another, and plenty to learn from another.

Here are my choices of thirteen key items that could be particularly useful

to any faculty getting into teacher evaluation. Whatever else you find along the way, have these on hand and make good use of them. They can give perspectives, surprises, ideas, information, experiences, and theories against which to bounce off yours. Then you're launched. Here they are.

Administrative Appraisal: A Step to Improved Leadership, by Robert E. Greene. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (1972). A very useful 48-page pamphlet. See especially "State of the Art" (pp. 1-10), on the "instruments" process, and the section on self-appraisal and motivation (pp. 24-26).

The Administrator and Organizational Renewal. National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services, George Washington University, Washington, D.C. 20037 (1973). A 44-page pamphlet of short, specific, informative pieces giving recommendations, case studies of schools and communities, a vivid three pages (23-25) introducing "Management by Objectives," and some surprises in a description of peer evaluation in the Duluth public schools (pp. 26-27).

American Nonpublic Schools: Patterns of Diversity, by Otto F. Kraushaar. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972. An enormous study with so much richness of information and perspective that no serious reader dare allow himself to be overwhelmed by it and turn away. Try plunging straight into "Teachers and Teaching in Private Schools" (pp. 143-172), and on into "Styles in Leadership: Headmasters and Principals" (pp. 173-200), and see where this leads you.

Analytical Study of Instructional Personnel Policies in NAIS Member Schools, a report prepared for NAIS by Henry Dahlberg, Jr., in December 1972. NAIS, 4 Liberty Square, Boston, Mass. 02109. Its section on "Evaluation" appears in Exhibit VI, below.

Choosing a Private School, by John C. Esty, Jr. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974. This searching and wise book is aimed at (and shows genuine respect for) parents, and it is an excellent "instrument" for a school faculty to use to take a close look at itself. "How to Judge a School" (pp. 79-101) gives teachers and administrators an idea of what astute parents may be looking for. I have gone back and back to the chapter on "Teachers and Teaching" (pp. 137-149) and see it as a splendid basis for a series of ongoing meetings and conversations, as is the whole book.

"Evaluating School Personnel," theme of the February 1973 issue of *The National Elementary Principal*. National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209. Indispensable for any faculty group getting launched in this whole area. There are 19 articles and six special features in a total of 112 pages. My copy is so marked up, underlined, checked, and fingered that I hesitate to name even five or six especially helpful parts. The collected items in the footnotes and bibliographies in this one issue would provide a lifework (and a lively one). With some reasonable selecting and ambitious partners, teachers and administrators can move from these pages into as massive an exploration as they are willing to undertake, a lot of the journey indicated here.

Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs. National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, Va. 22209 (1974). Helpful descriptions of trends and actual programs in 64 pages of short, well-organized pinpointings of very interesting news.

Humanizing Schools: New Directions, New Decisions, by Douglas Heath. Hayden Book Co., 50 Essex St., Rochelle Park, N.J. 07762 (1971). I know of no book that can provide as searching and personal a challenge to a total school faculty as this one. It is devastating and inspiring, as evocative and pertinent to the first-grade teacher as it is to the twelfth-grade teacher, to the old pro as to the novice. It should be in somebody's hand, open and ready, in any meeting of people who are examining their school's and their own goals, practices, and style. Douglas Heath is professor of psychology at Haverford College and is widely known and valued in schools through his writings and research and in conferences and seminars, including some key ones sponsored by NAIS.

Manual for School Evaluation. Commission on Independent Secondary Schools, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, 131 Middlesex Turnpike, Burlington, Mass. 01803 (1972). A rich and challenging document, described by Ralph O. West in his introduction as "designed to be in a continuous process of revision." Its section on "Professional Staff" appears as Exhibit V, below.

New Perspectives on Teacher Education, by Donald J. McCarty and associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973. Sixteen contributors have their say, with plenty that independent school people can use and learn from—and enjoy. I found especially helpful Lindley Stiles and Jack Bils on "National Accrediting" (pp. 112-138), Edgar Friedenberg's "Critique of Current Practice" (pp. 25-39), Theodore Sizer's "Teacher Education for the 1980's" (pp. 40-52), Harold Howe's "Improving Teacher Education through Exposures to Reality" (pp. 53-66), Herbert Klieboard on "The Question in Teacher Education" (pp. 8-24), and Dr. McCarty's two sections (pp. 1-7, 234-244)—but there is plenty more.

Professional Growth: What Is It, and Whose Responsibility? Independent School Association of Massachusetts, 23 School St., Andover, Mass. 01810 (1973). Twenty pages of experienced reflection from key independent school teachers and administrators (Mary Eliot, Peter Gunness, Edes Wilson, Robert Hawley, Theodore Sizer), with the bonus of Sizer's 29-item annotated bibliography for teachers, which appears as Exhibit II, below.

Selection and Evaluation of Teachers, by Dale L. Bolton. McCutchan Publishing Corp., 2526 Grove St., Berkeley, Calif. 94704 (1973). Bolton, professor and chairman of educational administration at the University of Washington, in Seattle, gives an illuminating "Summary of Research and Practice" (pp. 1-47). Don't miss it, or the section on "Evaluation of Teachers (pp. 95-130), or, for that matter, the rest of it. The 15-page bibliography looks formidable but could be a gold mine for an enterprising faculty committee that wants to explore the topic.

Wad-ja-Get? by Howard Kirschenbaum, Sidney B. Simon, and Rodney W. Napier. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1971. A readable, provocative, and powerful presentation of evidence, questions, contradictions, hopes on the way we grade students. The connections between that subject and the evaluation of teachers needs a very close look.

Exhibit II

On Teaching and Learning: Some Basic Readings for Teachers

The annotated bibliography by Theodore R. Sizer, Headmaster of Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts, mentioned in Exhibit I, is reprinted here from the 20-page pamphlet *Personal Growth: What Is It, and Whose Responsibility?* (Independent School Association of Massachusetts, 23 School St., Andover, Mass. 01810; 1973).

Including this bibliography is an act of some courage, since the first ten readers will go through the roof when they don't find their favorite Seminal Books on the list! Even so, it is enormously helpful to line this list up beside any teacher's or faculty's "indispensables." It is also a reminder that, whatever study goes into the process of teacher evaluation in a school, there needs to be interwoven with it an ongoing study of what we are about as teachers in the first place.

Bailyn, Bernard. *Education in the Forming of American Society.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960. The classic historical monograph relating family structure and schooling in colonial America.

Banfield, Edward C. *The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1970. Banfield's particular definition of "social class" is arresting, especially for educators.

Bloom, Benjamin. *A Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.* New York: David McKay, 1961. The classic "list" of goals.

Bruner, Jerome. *On Knowing: Essays for the Left Hand.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

———*The Process of Education.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960. Bruner's writing is as stimulating as it is lucid.

Clark, Kenneth B. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power.* New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

———*A Design for the Attainment of High Academic Achievement for the Students of the Public Elementary and Junior High Schools of Washington, D.C.* New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Council, 1970. Basic reading on ghetto education.

Coleman, James, et al. *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966. The celebrated "Coleman Report."

Coleman, James S., ed. *Education and Political Development.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965. Thought-provoking for social studies teachers, particularly Coleman's introduction.

Conant, James B. *The American High School Today.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

——— *Slums and Suburbs.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961. A classic, interestingly dated to 1970's eyes.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Genius of American Education.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1965.

——— *The Transformation of the School.* New York: Knopf, 1961. Classics.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1916. Another classic.

Featherstone, Joseph. *Schools Where Children Learn.* New York: Liveright, 1971. The best on English primary schools.

Holt, John. *How Children Fail.* New York: Pitman, 1964. The best of Holt.

Jencks, Christopher, et al. *Inequality.* New York: Basic Books, 1972. Provocative, largely misunderstood modern analysis.

Katz, Michael B. *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools.* New York: Praeger, 1971. A usefully polemic study of 19th century city schools.

Kaufman, Bel. *Up the Down Staircase.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965. The ultimate in pedagogical tragicomedies.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Education for Justice: A Modern Statement of the Platonic View." In *Moral Education: Five Lectures.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

——— and Mayer, Rochelle. "Development as the Aim of Education." *Harvard Educational Review,* vol. 42, no. 4 (November 1972), pp. 449-496. Two of the most provocative essays by "developmentalists" available.

Mosteller, Frederick, and Moynihan, Daniel P., eds. *On Equality of Educational Opportunity.* New York: Random House, 1972. More on "Coleman."

Myrdal, Gunnar. *The Challenge of World Poverty: A World Anti-Poverty Program in Outline.* New York: Pantheon, 1970. Myrdal (whose *American Dilemma* is still useful) brings extraordinary insight to our chauvinism.

Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. *Teaching as a Subversive Activity.* New York: Delacorte, 1969. A useful and witty polemic.

Scheffler, Israel. "Philosophical Models of Teaching." *Harvard Educational Review,* vol. 33, no. 2 (Spring 1965), pp. 131-143. A cool and lucid analysis, short and to the point.

Silberman, Charles. *Crisis in the Classroom.* New York: Random House, 1970. The current, popular Bible on contemporary schools.

Skinner, B. F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity.* New York: Knopf, 1971. Provocative, especially alarming to liberals.

Stodolsky, Susan, and Lesser, Gerald S. "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged." *Harvard Educational Review,* vol. 37, no. 4 (Fall 1967), pp. 546-593. A useful, and scholarly, paper on "poor" kids.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *The Aims of Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1929. A classic.

Exhibit III

Northfield Mount Hermon School's Faculty-Evaluation Program

Northfield Mount Hermon School, in Massachusetts, has been at work on a new approach to faculty evaluation since 1971. A number of people outside the school have come to know about it, ask about it, argue with it, and learn from it.

In the seminars on teacher evaluation that Fred Peterson, of Phillips Academy, and Peter Gunness, of Buckingham Browne & Nichols School, have been running in and beyond the state of Massachusetts, the Northfield Mount Hermon experience has been crucial. Each session has offered a couple of hours to talk with Jean Hatheway, academic dean of the school, and with one or another colleagues she has invited to join the group.

Central to the experience at Northfield Mount Hermon are some important decisions well worth noting: (1) all new teachers since 1971 have been in the evaluation process, and it is now a part of the contract of all new teachers; (2) teachers who were at the school before 1971 may be evaluated at their request, and a good many have taken this opportunity; (3) nobody is forced to be evaluated; and (4) the process has an atmosphere of partnership and support. I was in a group where a teacher in the first month of her second year of teaching spoke with particular appreciation and zest about the evaluation process, the spirit of it, what she had learned from it, including how she had come to know other teachers through it, and what she had gained from that knowledge.

The danger of presenting a "package" like this is that it makes the whole process look so neat and completed. Mrs. Hatheway stresses that it is anything but that. The school is constantly changing, testing, "evaluating the evaluation," and does not see its program as a fixed system. The program has been going long enough for the school to begin to see some values and some problems that might easily have been missed in the middle of the first year.

There is a danger, too, in any other school's seeing this as a model of The Way to Do It. ("After all, it was written up in an NAIS publication . . .") This is only a sample. Something good is clearly going on here. But the exact program might be disastrous in a different setting, and one piece of it

that a reader might particularly value and want to consider for his own school might be a piece that Northfield Mount Hermon will seriously question, or change radically, after this report is published.

Here is a sample, then, much of it in the words of those who worked on it or prepared the instruments, questions, and approaches, and who are experiencing the results of the evaluation process in the school.

General statement from the Northfield Mount Hermon faculty handbook

> The most important and valuable part of the evaluation process is the class observation with discussion before and after the class visits. It has been found most effective to have three people serve as evaluators, 1. the department chairman, 2. a colleague in the same department and 3. a teacher from another department selected from a list of volunteers. The department chairman invites the evaluators after discussion with the teacher being evaluated and after checking schedules. Each evaluator is expected to visit one class for three consecutive meetings and it is essential that the evaluator be informed of the goals and material to be covered. It is also advisable for the evaluator to do the assignments in advance if possible, and it does often add to the enjoyment of the class visits. Discussions following the class visits should include a sharing of all written comments on the evaluation forms. Each evaluator fills out the standard class observation form and the department chairman and department member each have a second form to fill out to complete their part of the evaluation. Evaluation comments are also solicited from Deans of Center, Dorm Directors, and Athletic Directors when appropriate. Student Evaluations complete the process and Student Evaluation sheets are now given to all students in all sections to get the best coverage. They are returned to the department chairman who prepares a summary for the teacher, because to share the student forms directly would destroy anonymity by recognized handwriting.
>
> This evaluation process has been designed to be supportive, to enable each teacher evaluated to study his own performance and to view it through the eyes of others.

Self-evaluation

If a teacher wants to get into the evaluation process at all, he begins with self-evaluation. Note the clear assumptions in the three-paragraph headnote to the self-evaluation form about a teacher's own ongoing self-evaluation and about adding a dimension to the school's understanding and appreciation of the teacher. (Mrs. Hatheway speaks with special appreciation of materials Northfield Mount Hermon has used from Greenfield Community College, Greenfield, Mass., the school's best single source for instruments, questionnaires, and the like, when it began to develop its evaluation program.)

NORTHFIELD MOUNT HERMON SCHOOL

Self-Evaluation Form for the file of _____

One means of up-grading professional effectiveness is self-evaluation. To facilitate the process we have devised the attached questionnaire, which we are asking you to fill out. Completing the questionnaire will be useful in two ways: First and foremost, it will get you to think about your own strengths and shortcomings. (You probably evaluate your own teaching continually, but the questionnaire should help you to do it in a more formal, perhaps more precise, way.) Second, it should add a dimension to the school's understanding and appreciation of you as a teacher.

Try to avoid two common pitfalls in your self-appraisal: First, do not let modesty keep you from being very explicit about your assets. Second, try to be equally candid about your shortcomings. As teachers and as students of particular disciplines we are well aware that individuals are less knowledgeable in some areas of a discipline than in others, just as they have both good days and bad days in the classroom. We also appreciate only too well that every teacher has certain methods and approaches with which he is very comfortable and adept, as well as those with which he is less proficient.

One final comment on the questionnaire: You will notice that it is divided into two parts. The first section, that which deals with subject area and classroom approach, is obviously the most important. The second section, dealing with your overall activities and experiences, asks for additional information. Provide all information that will contribute to the picture of you as a teacher and member of the Northfield Mount Hermon community.

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Self-Evaluation

Section 1

1. Within your own discipline, in what areas do you have greatest interest?
2. In which areas do you regard yourself as a successful teacher?
3. In what areas do you feel you need improvement?
4. Do you feel that your discipline is best taught by a particular approach (method) and, if so, which approach and why do you feel it is the best?
5. As a teacher in a Boarding Secondary School, what is your goal with respect to your students?
   A. Academic
   B. Social-Personal
6. Describe what you have found most gratifying in your work at Northfield Mount Hermon.
7. Describe what you have found most disappointing or frustrating in your work at Northfield Mount Hermon.

Section 2

NAME _____ Year appointed to N or MH or NMH _____

1. ACADEMIC RESPONSIBILITIES: YEAR 19___ - ___

	1st Term	2nd Term	3rd Term
Number of Students	_____	_____	_____
Number of Sections	_____	_____	_____
Number of Preparations	_____	_____	_____

2. OTHER ACADEMIC DUTIES

3. DORMITORY RESPONSIBILITIES
   Name of Dormitory _____ Number of Students _____
   Approximate number of hours per week _____

4. ATHLETIC ASSIGNMENTS
   Fall _____ Number of Students _____
   Approximate number of hours per week _____
   Winter _____ Number of Students _____
   Approximate number of hours per week _____
   Spring _____ Number of Students _____
   Approximate number of hours per week _____

5. OTHER SCHOOL RESPONSIBILITIES
   Club or Activity Advisor _____
   Number of Students _____ Approximate number of hours per week _____
   Administrative Assignments (i.e., Academic Dean, etc.)
   _____
   Committee Assignments _____
   Approximate number of hours per week _____

6. COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES (Organization, Offices held, etc.)

The department chairman

The department chairman is a crucial person in the evaluation process at Northfield Mount Hermon. Here are the questions the department chairman comments on, plus a sheet to guide his classroom visiting and reporting. Following these forms is a sample report by a department head, to suggest something of one person's approach to this process.

DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN EVALUATION FORM for the file of _____

Since information from administration offers important insights into improvement of particular areas of professional performance, would you please rate the above named instructor according to the criteria listed below. Please omit those areas where you feel you have no basis for judgment. Place your responses in the space to the left of each numbered item, using the following rating scale: 3 = superior; 2 = satisfactory; 1 = needs improvement; 0 = unsatisfactory.

Statements are often more helpful than any check list. Include any information you think is pertinent or useful.

_____1. Academic competence.

_____2. Ability to get along with others.

_____3. Participation in division or curriculum activities.

_____4. Participation in department committee assignments.

_____5. Reliability in carrying out professional responsibilities.

_____6. Reliability in getting routine work (grades, book orders, etc.) in on time.

_____7. Meeting classes regularly and on time.

_____8. Concern for professional growth and improvement.

_____9. Accessibility to students.

Signature _____

Date _____

* * * * * * * * *

Class Observation Report for the file of _____

Observer _____

Subject _____ No. in Class _____

Approach(es) Used: Lecture _____ Exposition _____
Demonstration _____ Discussion _____

To the Observer: Please respond specifically to every part of the following questions. Where the question is not appropriate to the particular class, please so indicate.

1. Comment on the instructor's clarity in a) exposition b) questioning of students and c) responding to questions.
2. Did the students seem involved in the learning process? How was this involvement manifested?
3. What, if any, teaching devices were used? Could this particular class have been more effective if others were used?
4. What impressed you most about this class?
5. Every instructor has a characteristic manner toward his students. Try to describe this attitude as you perceived it.
6. The teacher being evaluated would like to have you observe and evaluate the following:

7. Offer comments or suggestions for improvement; please try to offer at least one specific suggestion.

* * * * * * * * *

Department Chairman's Report

_____'s evaluation followed the current format of the English Department. In addition to her self-evaluation, comments from other faculty members (_____and me) and 18 student evaluations were returned to me.

_____'s ease and assurance in the classroom is an obvious result of her experience. I had the feeling throughout my visits that I was observing a real "professional." Although she is not dogmatic in her interpretations of literature, she does know where she is headed, or at least gives the impression that she does. At times I found that she did speak quickly (something she asked other visitors to look for), but I had a feeling that she was simply trying to cover a lot of material and felt somewhat rushed. She communicates her sense of purpose to her students and gives them a sense of security. _____ has an easy rapport with her students without ever giving the sense that she is surrendering control of the class.

In my visits she concentrated on very close readings of the text, really scrutinizing the assignment. There was little room for sloppy interpretation. This led several students to remark in their evaluations that _____ was too concerned with "trivia." Inevitably students feel this way when they are held to detailed analysis, but do not see the significance of it. I know that _____ does point out to the students the reasons for reading, and writing, so carefully. Their comments indicate that it is impossible to do this too much. _____'s attention to detail is also evident in her teaching of writing. She is a tough grader who holds up high standards to her students. Although students complain, as Department Chairman I have nothing but praise for _____'s doing this. She is concerned with all aspects of her students' writing—grammar, spelling, organization, control. She spends as much time as anyone in the department in individual student conferences.

The quality that impressed me most about _____ was her desire to learn. She is as much of a student as her students are. Several evaluations mentioned how well-read she is. In my visits I found her mentioning other books to illustrate various points or draw parallels with the assigned text. Her enthusiasm for literature is constantly apparent.

Evaluation by a fellow teacher in one's field

The note preceding the following two forms reflects the tone and intention of the whole process. Note particularly that following the class visit the teacher and the visitor meet and talk together, and that the teacher sees what has been written before it goes to the department chairman. Here is a good example of how this process could go terribly wrong if the atmosphere and spirit in the school worked against it rather than supporting it: the idea of a colleague's coming in and taking notes, then discussing the notes with

the teacher and passing them to the department head, could be appalling to some, with the visiting teacher viewed as some nobler-than-thou vigilante spying for "them," *or* the visiting teacher as an advocate lobbying for his friend in a joint conspiracy against "them." It could go either way, or several other ways, positive or negative.

TO EVALUATORS:

These forms are to be filled out by a colleague in the department of the person being evaluated. Both of these forms are to be filled out, shared with the teacher being evaluated during a discussion following the class visit, and then turned over to the department chairman.

Your willingness to serve as an evaluator is greatly appreciated and the time commitment recognized. It is hoped that you will enjoy the process and find it a valuable learning experience for yourself. Remember that many people do not recognize their own strengths so it can be beneficial to point them out. Everything you can offer in the way of constructive criticism will be of benefit to the teacher being evaluated.

The more information that you can collect about the goals, methods and assignments before you attend class the more valuable the experience will be for you and for the teacher being evaluated.

* * * * * * * * *

Colleague Evaluation Form for the file of _____

One part of a Faculty Professional Improvement and Evaluation Program involves the professional judgment and insight of one's colleagues. You have been asked to visit the classes of the teacher named above, as one whose experience and close association may provide a useful source of first-hand information regarding professional performance.

Please answer the questions as candidly as possible, responding only to those areas wherein you feel especially knowledgeable. Your thoughtful assistance is appreciated.

1. From your particular point of view, and observation, what is/are this individual's greatest asset(s) as a teacher?
2. From your particular point of view, and observation, what is/are this individual's greatest asset(s) as a member of the school community?
3. What areas of professional activity or responsibility, if any, do you see as needing attention, evaluation, improvement, change?
4. In your judgment, what are this individual's shortcomings?
5. Additional insights or comments (use reverse side if necessary).

_____ _____

(Signature of Respondent) Date

* * * * * * * * *

Class Observation Report for the file of _____

Observer _____

Subject _____ No. in Class _____

Approach(es) Used: Lecture _____ Exposition _____
Demonstration _____ Discussion _____

To the Observer: Please meet with the teacher being evaluated sometime before the class visits so that you will know the goals and be able to read the assignments.

Please respond specifically to every part of the following questions. Where the question is not appropriate to the particular class, please so indicate.

1. Comment on the instructor's clarity in a) exposition b) questioning of students and c) responding to questions.
2. Did the students seem involved in the learning process? How was this involvement manifested?
3. What, if any, teaching devices were used? Could this particular class have been more effective if others were used?

Evaluation by a teacher in another field

This kind of evaluation appears to be a popular and important part of Northfield Mount Hermon's experience. It brings together people who might remain quite isolated from one another, begins relationships across fields that might once have been, to each teacher, "Greek to me."

The same introductory explanation that is used with evaluation by a teacher in one's own field is used here, though the questions that follow are different. Here is an observer's comment on one of the forms.

Class Observation Report for the file of _____

Observer _____

Subject _____ No. in Class _____

Approach(es) Used: Lecture _____ Exposition X
Demonstration _____ Discussion X
"A variety of methods, according to what was being done."

To the Observer: Please respond specifically to every part of the following questions. Where the question is not appropriate to the particular class, please so indicate.

1. Comment on the instructor's clarity in a) exposition b) questioning of students and c) responding to questions.

   "Exposition was clear and concise, with due emphasis being given to important material. Questioning of students was clear and relaxed. Questions and comments were welcomed and appreciated. Questions were answered carefully."

2. Did the students seem involved in the learning process? How was this involvement manifested?

   "Students were definitely involved, some more than others, of course. They were responsive and interested in what was going on in the class. They listened to each other's research papers with appreciation and responded with comments when led by the teacher. A lively discussion took place one day—a discussion in which most of the students took part."

3. What, if any, teaching devices were used? Could this particular class have been more effective if others were used?

   "This was not the kind of class in which teaching devices were needed. The approach varied as needed."

4. What impressed you most about this class?

   "The atmosphere of the classroom. It was relaxed and informal without being lax. The relationship between teacher and students and between the students themselves was friendly and responsive. There was an appreciation of one another and a sharing of ideas."

5. Every instructor has a characteristic manner toward his students. Try to describe this attitude as you perceived it.

   "Friendly and relaxed in manner, yet with firm expectations. _____ expects the students to work, but her expectations are realistic. She is definitely interested in them, both as students and as individuals. I cannot imagine that the students would be afraid in this class. _____ is clearly a competent teacher with a good knowledge of her subject and the ability to transmit this knowledge to the students and to lead them to think for themselves."

6. The teacher being evaluated would like to have you observe and evaluate the following:

   Whether I talk too much or not. "Continue to work toward saying less yourself and encouraging the students to say more. It's a problem most of us have."

   Whether I talk too fast or not. "It is natural for you to talk quickly and your voice tends to drop sometimes, giving the impression that what you are saying is being said only in passing. Unfortunately what you are saying loses some of its importance in this way."

   Anything else that might impede communication or discourage the students from thinking for themselves. "Nothing that I observed."

7. Offer comments or suggestions for improvement; please try to offer at least one specific suggestion.

   "My suggestions for improvement are contained in #6. It might also help to encourage the quiet students to participate more. Perhaps _____ does this—I don't know. I thoroughly enjoyed visiting _____'s class."

Student evaluation of a teacher

Northfield Mount Hermon's use of student evaluation sheets is interesting

and well worth close study before one begins to argue with the potential booby traps in them. Central to the school's approach are the following steps: (1) Student forms go straight to the department head, not to the teacher. (2) The department head puts the ratings together on a single sheet for use in his conference with the teacher. For example, under item 2, "Presentation of Material," in a given class, the department head's form reproduced below shows that one student marked "Very hard to follow," two marked the right end of "Very hard to follow," nine marked "Reasonably understandable," and six marked "Makes subject very clear." (3) The department head also prepares for the teacher a single report with all the major comments from students on it, including conflicting ones. In this way, the teacher and the department head have an across-the-class picture of a class's response and comments. A sample of the collected checkings of a class and the collected comments on the same class are shown here.

STUDENT EVALUATION

INSTRUCTOR _____ Dept. _____ Course _____ Period _____

1. Knowledge of Subject

   (0) Knowledge of field inadequate (1) Adequate (9) Knowledgeable (8) Expert

   Comment:

2. Presentation of Material

   (1) Very hard to follow (2) (9) Reasonably understandable (6) Makes subject very clear

   Comment:

3. Balance of Breadth and Detail

   (3) Gets bogged down in trivia (1) Generalizes too much (11) Reasonable balance (4) Good balance of breadth and detail

   Comment:

4. Enthusiasm for Subject

   (0) Seems disinterested (0) Mildly interested (8) Interested (10) Displays great enthusiasm

   Comment:

5. Fairness in Marking

   (3) Partial and prejudiced (12) Reasonably fair (3) Very fair and impartial

   Comment:

6. Attitude toward Student

(0) Unsympathetic and intolerant (14) Reasonably good: average (4) Sympathetic and understanding

Comment:

7. Fairness of Work Load

(0) Unnecessarily light (16) Reasonably adequate (2) Excessively heavy

Comment:

8. Over-All Summary as Instructor

(1) Unsatisfactory (4) Average (9) Above average (4) Outstanding

General comment:

* * * * * * * * *

SUMMARY OF STUDENT COMMENTS IN _____ CLASS

1. Knowledge of Subject

I'd say higher than knowledgeable but not necessarily expert. Backs up ideas with proofs from other sources than just the particular book being discussed. Much background info given.

She has taught this course before many times and has obviously read all the 19th Century Novels that have been written.

She really knows what she's talking about, and therefore the class is highly enlightening.

The teacher knows the books well and prepares appropriate quizzes.

Knows an awful lot about many subjects.

It's quite obvious this woman enjoys literature.

She takes much for granted that we always know what she is talking about; expects a lot of time spent on course, papers are rewritten, trivia at the least.

2. Presentation of Material

She talks very quickly, often not finishing a sentence. She seems to lecture at "78 speed" and often doesn't see hands raised or hear questions. It seems very hard for her to allow any kind of open discussion between students without having something to say (often trivial anyway).

Usually very clear.

She takes a very fair amount of time to discuss important points that must be made clear, which is important.

Some interpretation is relatively opinionated by the teacher on tests and quizzes.

More student disagreement and counter-proof should be permitted.

Gets confusing when she goes into detail.

Makes subject very clear and very interesting.

I have a bit of difficulty trying to follow the discussions; we would get off on sidetracks a lot.

Except homework assignments were vague. She had a definite idea, then didn't get it across well enough and then you were in the wrong sometimes because you didn't get the proper assignment.

7/8 of the time she makes subject very clear.

Does not emphasize important material; does not explain what she particularly wants, mainly in terms of papers; the organization, footnotes, etc. Looks down upon papers written about feelings: likes factual material and that is not *all* of English.

Occasionally hard to follow.

She takes what we do know for granted.

3. Balance of Breadth and Detail

While discussing a subject, she'll go off into something trivial and immaterial. Even if what she's saying is interesting, it takes time away from the things we are studying.

Sometimes I feel we get bogged down in trivia, but not too often. Sometimes I feel things are stretched, and discussion is carried just to fill the last part of the class, but is not necessary or helpful.

The balance is good yet some generalizations in the form of interpretation is biased.

Gets off on a lot of tangents and a little trivia. Every little thing was in a form, and if not done right points were taken off. Dictated her punctuation outlines instead of letting us learn outlines and do our own. Hard to bring out your own creativity because she had everything in set form. Sometimes thought I was in 6th grade!

Too many specifics involved in her teaching which are unnecessary. Other comments pertaining to this under other questions.

Occasionally gets bogged down in trivia.

4. Enthusiasm for Subject

Seems very interested and gets excited during some discussions.

It seems as if that's all she does, is read novels. But I know differently.

Her enthusiasm is spread to her students and therefore gives the classroom a more intellectual atmosphere.

The teacher is always very excited and interested in the class and the material. I don't mean this badly—because she shows such enthusiasm it is easier for students to be enthusiastic in class.

Again, knew so much about it.

Loves to bring in "goodies" about some story—most often to compare it with some story I've never heard of!!

Does not make material interesting.

5. Fairness in Marking

Except in marking late papers.

She knows what she wants and tries to get the student to write his best. However, some of the things she marks down seem trivial, such as minor-grammar mistakes. I think the over-all idea and statements backing it up are more important than grammar mistakes (small ones, that is).

The papers I feel I have worked hard on, and done a good job usually have the poorest grades on them, but I can still see the reasons for the grades.

She is impartial, but I think a little too difficult a marker.

Again, more room should be allowed for disagreement and even for mistakes. Grading is a bit too hard, too high standards are demanded with the cry of "college will be harder." This tends to discourage the student.

She wants too much detail especially in ten minute essays.

I thought_____graded a little hard. It wasn't prejudice but it was very picky. Marked every little mistake, never missed anything; because of this she sometimes missed your point and was more worried about construction etc. than the idea.

I feel her marking is too hard on the side of the student. She makes it utterly impossible to achieve an A. No matter how many times a paper is corrected it seems she always digs and finds some "disastrous" mistake.

In papers, does not consider content as much as she should; mostly grammatical and sentence structure. Wants things much too specific than really should be, hates things at all generalized or slightest bit vague. Very hard marker.

She is too hard.

6. Attitude toward Student

With some students it depends on whether she likes you or not, she will not listen to you if she doesn't.

One realizes she wants to help you as long as you do things "exactly" by her book.

Only if you came and saw her for conferences every week about your work. A bit hard to work with becomes sometimes a brick wall about things. Again her set ways.

Very demanding, understanding though not necessarily sympathetic.

We were to make an appointment with her after each paper. I thought that established a pretty good relationship between student and teacher. She was really concerned with *teaching* us something.

Again, the high standards of the teacher do not allow enough room for imperfection.

Disagreement *is* allowed in class, but tests and papers are very stiffly graded.

She's interested not only in class work but what's happening outside the classroom.

Her system of marking late papers is ridiculous. The points taken off are much too great. She says it's because when the papers are due, we discuss them in class and those that are late have an advantage after hearing the discussion. But, she always holds off the discussion, if any, because some papers haven't come in. Therefore those late students have no advantage anyway. One paper of mine (no discussion) was marked down from B+ to D+ because it was one and a half days late, from a perfectly legitimate and unavoidable excuse. It was very frustrating and discouraging. In her correcting papers she seems to leave very little room for freedom and personal preferences. She seems to correct very much "by the book." In some cases I think it's good, but not to this extent. In class I find it very hard to keep my attention because of the way she speaks. I would like her to look at the saying "quality, not quantity."

7. Fairness of Work Load

Sometimes too heavy.

Sometimes not too much homework but often given assignments such as papers, term papers that must be written in two weeks.

Except that being new in her class winter term, made a lot of make-up work. That everyone else had done all through the first term. (Seemed a bit unnecessary.)

A bit heavier, then it is adequate.

I was never bogged down at all, although there was an assignment every night.

Inconsistently heavy and light.

No problem in reading the material or performing the papers assigned.

I believe she assigns too many compositions and papers.

Just enough to keep me in line and sit me down to work every night.

Assignments are good!

8. Over-All Summary as Instructor

_____is a good teacher, but is sometimes hard to understand. She grades unfairly, usually too low.

I think she is a good teacher; definitely knows her subject, but she is too old fashioned. She wants us to go by her ways; where there is no room for compromise.

Very hard teacher and is knowledgeable but would be better in an elective, such as any about Shakespear. Is vague about assignments and stresses unnecessary trivia.

I find _____ a good teacher. She undoubtedly knows her subject and is very much engrossed in it. The one big criticism I have about her methods is that she's too old fashioned in her ways: one must own a "correction" notebook, grammar notebook, one must not write on the back of a paper, it's counted off if the "proper heading" is not correct in every aspect. She often times brushes over things assuming the class knows them, and later to find that we didn't understand it (as a result of poor grades on tests). She expects a lot of independent study on worksheets etc. and if the material still doesn't make sense she urges an office hour, fine, but in three or four instances the entire class hadn't grasped it either. Other than these gripes _____is fine—she can teach you a lot if you're strong enough to overcome her excessive pickiness and her "It must be done my way" line. She could use some "flexibility" in her ways.

I think she would be good in an elective course where there isn't such a stress on having to learn certain things as in the _____[course]. Because she is so knowledgeable in areas she would probably be quite good in electives; as far as this class, I think it should be fun and a bit lighter. She stresses too much her way of grammar etc. on you and not letting you develop. Of the students who were new in Winter term, we all were a bit frustrated with her because we had to learn diagramming, copy lots of notes etc. that the others had done first term. Too particular. "What was the point in this?" was asked a lot. For instance, my heading for a paper wasn't put on every paper, and it was commented on. Many *tedius* things.

_____was among the finest instructors I've known. I stress the fact

that she is very demanding of her students in that they must perform in accordance to her demands, and her demands are rather great. She had a tendency to take the game of explicit detail a bit too far at times, but I do understand her intentions by such an attitude towards teaching.

I feel _____ is outstanding in her subject. She is a hard teacher but she really wants to help her students and bring them up to a college level. Perhaps that is why she is considered such a hard teacher.

She has made me really interested in the subject—it is my favorite subject. I look forward to her class everyday and always enjoy it. I have learned a great deal and can see my own improvement from day to day. I couldn't give a better recommendation.

She gets me very interested in the subject and I get a lot out of the course but her want of examples, detail, and structure get me down. I don't seem to do well on papers and tests even though I know the material. I feel I have to be a walking book instead of using my mind.

I learned a great deal in _____ _____'s class. I found her very challenging but very fair.

The teacher knows the material, knows English grammar and skills very well, but the students are from multisided backgrounds of English experience, with many having learned writing skills very different to those the teacher approves of. In general, the teacher needs to be more sensitive to the individual student, in particular to that student's abilities and not just that student's disability to write after the teacher's ideal.

Terrific teacher but no matter how hard I work I cannot improve my grade. I feel that I have greatly improved in English, but my grade does not show this improvement. I think that in grading our papers, she should try to recognize how hard we have tried.

I have put an awful lot into this course and do not feel justly rewarded.

She is very interested in her subject and in having the student learn. She assigns a great variety of papers in order to give us more experience which is very good.

On an overall summary I think she is just short of outstanding.

I like _____ very much because she really know what she's talking about and you can tell by her enthusiasm and presentation of material.

Works hard to develop students' writing and oral preciseness and clarity.

Reading load generally not too heavy, neither is written papers, etc.

She is very willing to help students and go over paper. Her tests are fair, and her knowledge of the subject is definitely very good. She is extremely well-read, and her examples of works by other authors add to class discussions.

Student evaluation of a course

Student course evaluations at Northfield Mount Hermon are done separately from teacher evaluations. Actually, the following questionnaire now seems too general to the students, teachers, and administrators who are involved in constantly reshaping and improving the evaluation process in the school. I include it here for its possible helpfulness and as an example of a

stage in this school's journey that it has already passed. Following the general questionnaire, however, is a sample of how one department—classics—is currently doing its own student-evaluation-of-the-course, now that the school has moved to quite separate approaches to course evaluation within each course. There is a message here for schools seeking over-all instruments that will work for every course (or every teacher), let alone every school!

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the teacher with information that should be useful to him in evaluating both himself and the course. Your own grades in the course should not unduly influence your responses. A student who has received high grades may still find the course or the teacher in need of improvement in certain areas. By the same token, a student who is having difficulty may still find most aspects of the course very satisfactory. Please be thoughtful and honest. This questionnaire is not intended to take the place of the more personal discussions between teacher and student on these matters. Thank you for your help.

Part One. Each of the following statements should be responded to in one of the following ways: A = agree; SA = strongly agree; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree; NA = not applicable or no opinion. Check the appropriate column.

	NA	SA	A	D	SD
1. The teacher's objectives for the course have been made clear.					
2. There was considerable agreement between the announced objectives and what has taken place.					
3. In this class I felt free to ask questions and to express opinions.					
4. The teacher was genuinely interested in my problems and progress in the course.					
5. I felt that I could question or disagree with an opinion expressed by the teacher.					
6. The teacher was adequately prepared for each class.					
7. Tests and examinations were fair.					
8. The teacher has been successful in achieving his announced objectives for the course.					
9. In general I have found the class meetings worthwhile.					
10. The teacher clearly explained his method of evaluating student progress.					
11. The teacher usually gave sufficient directions for me to					

understand what was expected in homework assignments.

12. The actual evaluation by the teacher of my progress followed the criteria he had announced.

13. The teacher usually gave me his analysis of the causes of my mistakes or failures by an oral or written comment.

14. The teacher presented difficult concepts in a clear and logical manner.

15. The information and ideas I have gained from this course are either of value to me now, or clearly will be in the future.

Part Two. Place a check mark next to the phrase which, in completing the statement, comes closest to describing your opinion.

1. In comparison with courses of equal credit, I have found this course:
a) more demanding_____ b) about average_____ c) less demanding_____

2. For me, the pace of the course was a) very fast_____ b) fast_____
c) about right_____ d) slow_____ e) very slow_____

3. Overall, the book(s) and other printed materials used in this course were:
a) excellent_____ b) good_____ c) fair_____ d) poor_____

3b. Please rate any individual texts listed below as follows: E = excellent; G = good; R = replace.

Title	Rating
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. I expect my final grade in this course to be: B— or higher_____ C+ or lower_____

5. Overall, I would rate any supplementary materials used, such as films, tapes, records, etc., as: a) excellent_____ b) good_____ c) fair_____ d) poor_____

5b. Please rate any individual instructional devices listed below. Use E = excellent; G = good; R = replace.

Instructional Device	Rating
_____	_____
_____	_____

* * * * * * * * *

COURSE EVALUATION IN CLASSICS DEPARTMENT

[now in use]

We have two methods of course evaluation currently in use. The first consists of a fairly informal but effective discussion between the Classics teacher of the appro-

priateness of our goals as a department, and within each course; and of the most effective methods in practice of attaining these goals. These discussions centre around methodology, course content, grading practices, the use of class and homework time, the role of testing and the basic mechanics of teaching Classical Studies. They have proved fruitful and helpful in reordering our priorities and methods of achieving them in practice.

The second method of evaluation is more formal. At the beginning of each term, students enrolled in all the elective courses in the department (Ancient History, Classical Civilization, 3rd and 4th year Language electives) are given a written statement of the *goals* of the course and of *their* obligations in trying to meet these goals. At the end of each term, a course evaluation form (see attached copy) is given to every student, and the results are tabulated and filed. From these forms, and from discussions between the teachers involved, we are able to obtain a fairly clear picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the courses we offer, and in some cases have reorganized the content and methodology of our courses in response to well-thought-out and responsible student suggestions. (We have also been able to act on student suggestions about new courses they would like to see offered; for example, the Mythology course was introduced in response to student requests; and the upper level Latin elective, Roman Comedy, has been expanded to include other forms of humour.)

* * * * * * * * * *

CLASSICS DEPARTMENT COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Name and number of course. Section. _____

1. Why did *you* take this course? What did you expect to get out of it?
2. How would you evaluate the *stated goals* of the course?
3. With what success have you achieved *your personal goals* in the course?
4. With what success do you think the *stated goals* of the course have been achieved?
5. What have you enjoyed most about the course?
6. What have you enjoyed least about the course?
7. How would you evaluate the content of the course?
8. How would you evaluate the material and techniques used?
   a. Books
   b. Audio-visual aids
   c. Classroom experience
   d. Other (include homework assignments, paper topics, tests, etc.)
9. How would you evaluate the work load in this course in comparison to other courses?
10. What suggestions do you have for improving the course for another year?
11. Any other comments?

Evaluation of administrators

The form shown below has been used, examined, explored, and is now being worked on some more at Northfield Mount Hermon. The school reports that it still isn't good enough, isn't useful or helpful enough. In any case, it should be included here, if only to make the point that the evaluation process certainly includes administrators, all of them, and that a school needs to work out really helpful ways to evaluate them. Thus department heads, division principals, and school heads get some perspectives on themselves, are part of the spirit of exploring "how good we are and how we can improve," and have some formal, organized way to find out how others see their efforts and respond to them.

NORTHFIELD MOUNT HERMON SCHOOL

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORM

Name of Administrator_____ Title_____

Outstanding = O, Satisfactory = S, Improvement needed = I, No opportunity to observe = N

1. PERSONALITY
   a. Ability to relate to teaching staff _____
   b. Ability to relate to students _____
   Comments:

2. EMPATHY
   a. Willingness to listen to problems _____
   b. Willingness to understand problems _____
   c. Willingness to help solve problems _____
   d. Willingness to listen to other points of view _____
   e. Willingness to understand other points of view _____
   Comments:

3. LEADERSHIP
   a. Creative contributor _____
   b. Organizer of programs _____
   c. Initiator of programs _____
   d. Analyzer or evaluator of programs _____
   Comments:

4. ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE
   a. Seeks opinions and ideas of colleagues _____
   b. Listens to opinions and ideas of colleagues _____
   c. Treats staff members as fellow professionals _____
   d. Relates impartially with fellow professionals _____
   e. Relates respectfully with fellow professionals _____

f. Makes decisions effectively _____
g. Follows through effectively on decisions _____
h. Accepts responsibility for his decisions _____
i. Deals promptly with matters referred to him _____

Comments:

5. ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE
   a. Shares ideas with staff openly _____
   b. Communicates decisions and rationale for decisions effectively _____
   c. Communicates decisions and rationale for decisions efficiently _____

   Comments:

6. ADAPTABILITY
   Ability to adapt effectively to change _____

   Comments:

7. DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY
   a. Ability to effectively delegate responsibility and authority _____
   b. Willingness to effectively delegate responsibility and authority _____

   Comments:

8. OVERALL EVALUATION

Name of Evaluator _____ Title or Position _____

Date _____

Beyond the forms and questionnaires

Jean Hatheway, Northfield Mount Hermon's academic dean, who has guided, encouraged, supported, and nourished this program in the school, and whose collaboration with department heads and teachers, experienced and new, continues to refine, change, and develop the approaches, made some points in conversations with me and at the Independent School Association of Massachusetts seminars that stress the fact that the program at Northfield Mount Hermon is far more than a summary of its forms and questionnaires. While this should be obvious, I need to emphasize it, especially after publishing all the forms here.

Mrs. Hatheway's choice for the single most important aspect of the program is the fact and the nature of the discussions with teachers that follow an evaluation visit or assembling a packet of forms. A lot of these conversations have to do with the evaluation process itself: how it is going, how good it is, ways to improve the approach, the questionnaires, the interviews, the visits. Thus the conversations themselves are the center of the ongoing shaping of the evaluation process. This is very different from hav-

ing a "system" that goes on, enclosed, with a committee that meets now and then to examine the "system." This fragment has turned over and over in my mind: "In our early stages of all this evaluation business, the teachers who asked to be in on it felt like guinea pigs, but in some kind of enthusiastic and enjoying way. They felt they were contributing—and, of course, they were—and not just having evaluation done to them."

The department chairmen are important in the process, of course, and here a school is very dependent on the style, astuteness, and supportiveness of each person in the department-head spot. The department head has a postevaluation talk with the teacher (two to three hours, not just a quick check in the hall), with all the information in hand from the teacher, visiting colleagues, the department head himself, and students. Then the teacher has a conversation with Mrs. Hatheway as academic dean. This method gives several perspectives *for* the teacher and *on* the teacher, and on the evaluation process itself.

Another crucial point Mrs. Hatheway stresses is that there is "complete openness" in the process: "Everything written is available to the teacher. This makes the evaluators careful in their wording, and frees the teacher from wondering what went down on that paper. The only thing a teacher does not see is the individual packet of student evaluation sheets. But he does see the collected ratings on each of the questions, and the collected comments, put together in one sheet, question by question."

A final reminder: the evaluation process is now built into the contracts of new teachers at the time of hiring. Northfield Mount Hermon now has a collection of "new" teachers of the past three years who have had this in their contracts and been through the process. Other teachers are evaluated only if they wish to be. Because of the spirit and tone of the process, a great many of the teachers have asked to join in and the morale that has emerged has been positive and sharing. As one teacher said to a group of us, "This was the best experience I had that first year, and it launched me in the school in so many ways that might never have happened without it."

Exhibit IV

Notes and Fragments on Teacher Evaluation from the Lower School at Sidwell Friends School

Some fragments from the elementary department of Sidwell Friends School, in Washington, D.C., seem to me useful and need to be included here. Janet Martin, principal of the Lower School, had done a good deal of work at Bank Street College of Education, in New York City, as a graduate student after her several years as a classroom teacher in independent schools. Some of the ideas and instruments included here came out of a special summer workshop for principals that she attended before starting in at Sidwell Friends.

Following are parts of a letter Janet Martin wrote about her work with evaluation of teachers and about herself in her first year as principal. The letter is informal, personal, and honestly reflects some of the hazards and hopes in this whole area. It speaks to anyone working on his own school's journey in teacher evaluation.

> . . . When I arrived in the fall of 1973, I had just spent a week at Bank Street College with a group of principals from inner city schools with Follow Through programs in their schools. Bank Street had worked out some forms for evaluation in those schools, and was teaching the principals how to use the forms with teachers and on themselves. So I brought copies of both to my faculty, with hopes we would work out our own, based on the Bank Street idea. (These are attached.)
>
> First, I distributed copies of the *Competency Rating* form for *Principals*, and asked them to look it over, so they could see a kind of job-definition of a principal. They didn't do anything with it, but the spaces to the right of the paper are for the principal to mark either "yes, I think I'm doing this," or "this is something I need to work on," or "I don't know how even to begin doing this and need help." I think it's the best thing for principals I've seen; it just depends how well people use it.
>
> A few weeks later I handed out the forms for teachers, and asked teachers to look them over for a basis of discussion when each one had a mid-year conference with me. As those individual conferences turned out, not many people got as far as reviewing the form. They were excellent, helpful talks, but people needed to talk about themselves first. However, everyone mentioned how help-

ful the form was in delimiting the task of teaching, and giving a base to form goals by. Again, the way they are employed is very important, so as to minimize threat and encourage growth.

This spring a committee of the faculty worked out the enclosed "Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation" at the same time our Middle School and our Upper School faculties were also doing this. We established that I would meet with every teacher early in the fall to discuss strengths, needs, and growth, then meet with anyone I had a concern about before December 1, so that person could have time to utilize suggestions, and to take his "grievance" (if he had one) about my concerns with his teaching to a faculty committee. I have no idea how it will work out in practice. I just know that the process of writing those Guidelines, and figuring out some fair evaluation procedure so no one would lose his job without notice was very security-producing for the faculty.

After thinking about teacher evaluation for some time, and seeing how threatening it is to teachers, I have some reservations about it. When I was teaching, I was desperate for some kind of top mark to strive for. The only comments on my teaching were rave-reviews, and I was fully aware of my youth, my failings, and my need for improvement everywhere. But no one gave me regular, supportive criticism. So the Bank Street forms really appealed to me at first.

It becomes very difficult, however, when supportive growth mechanisms also have to be used to determine salary-raises, promotions, tenure, and "separation." Is that sticky! I have no delusions about our system here. It will most probably be great for most teachers, this being a growth-conscious group. But in cases where someone's performance is poor, and separation from the school is necessary, I'm not sure that is ever a happy, understood-by-all process. So...

The following Bank Street College instrument and its use at Sidwell Friends School are described in the second paragraph of the above letter. Again, to the right of each question, the principal is asked to indicate something like: "Yes, I think I'm doing this," or "This is something I need to work on," or "I don't even know how to begin doing this and need help."

COMPETENCY RATING (ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL)

Personal Competencies

1. Demonstrates consistently through speech and action a belief in the dignity and worth of man. _____
2. Respects and appreciates the individuality of children and adults. _____
3. Recognizes the potential for further development inherent in every person, whether child or adult. _____
4. Integrates the world of ideas, knowledge, culture, and art in his/her work. _____
5. Develops open and honest relationships with a wide range of people of various age levels and different backgrounds and life experiences. _____

6. Acknowledges personal needs and is consistently able to distinguish them from the personal needs of others. _____
7. Responds positively to feedback and criticism. _____
8. Demonstrates an awareness of how self is perceived by others. _____
9. Demonstrates a perception of self as a learner. _____
10. Establishes a rapport within which the other person feels free to examine self. _____
11. Inspires, stimulates, and motivates others. _____
12. Has a set of goals for self. _____
13. Functions with a sense of humor. _____
14. Demonstrates the ability to conceptualize. _____
15. Demonstrates the ability to analyze. _____
16. Demonstrates the ability to communicate in writing. _____
17. Demonstrates the ability to communicate in speaking. _____

Organizational Competencies

18. Works with teachers and other school personnel to develop goals and objectives for the school. _____
19. Works with teachers and other school personnel to implement strategies for carrying out school objectives. _____
20. Works with teachers and other school personnel to develop and implement an assessment program for measuring the school's effectiveness. _____
21. Recruits and selects competent staff, including paraprofessionals. _____
22. Makes assignments of staff in line with identified competencies. _____
23. Encourages and sets the tone for a close working relationship among teachers, paraprofessionals, pupil personnel, staff members, and other ancillary personnel. _____
24. Delegates leadership responsibilities to a support system of administrative, teaching, paraprofessional, and specialist staff members. _____
25. Supervises operation and maintenance of the school building and facilities. _____
26. Facilitates planning for the school that anticipates future building and equipment requirements. _____
27. Is responsive to program, staff, and building needs in preparing the school budget. _____

28. Administers the financial resources of the school within established budgetary guidelines. _____

29. Maintains inventories and records of equipment, supplies, and instructional materials. _____

30. Assists in the selection of equipment, supplies, and instructional materials. _____

31. Demonstrates a knowledge of safety regulations pertaining to the school building, equipment, and supplies. _____

32. Works with staff to develop a safety program for the school. _____

33. Works with staff to develop procedures for reporting and handling emergency and accident situations. _____

34. Analyzes the climate for change in the school setting and outlines strategies for change to teachers and other school personnel. _____

35. Analyzes the climate for change in the school setting and interprets strategies for change to parents and the community. _____

Staff Development Competencies

36. Adds to the staff's understanding of the educational and social role of the school in the rapidly changing American society. _____

37. Adds to the staff's understanding of the fundamental concepts of child development. _____

38. Encourages teaching staff to think analytically about their own processes and programs. _____

39. Helps staff develop and maintain a professional library. _____

40. Plans and implements an in-service program for the continuing professional development of the school staff, including the special needs of paraprofessionals. _____

41. Provides for staff attendance at workshops, institutes, courses, and conferences relevant to their continuing professional development. _____

42. Provides the opportunities and makes arrangements for teachers to visit innovative programs. _____

43. Develops procedures for observing and evaluating teacher performance. _____

44. Identifies those aspects of a teacher's performance in need of development, and outlines alternative approaches to improvement. _____

45. Identifies and makes provisions for obtaining instructional materials and resources needed by teachers for instructional change. _____

46. Enables staff to become more competent through such techniques of interaction as consultation, encountering, confrontation, negotiation, and counseling. _____

47. Uses such training techniques as role playing, simulated case studies, growth exercises, and games. _____

48. Helps teaching staff develop procedures for diagnosing the learning needs of children. _____

49. Helps teaching staff develop procedures for diagnosing the learning styles of children. _____

50. Helps teaching staff develop procedures for identifying the special strengths, needs, abilities, and interests of children. _____

51. Helps teaching staff develop record-keeping and assessment procedures for evaluating individual child learning. _____

52. Outlines steps for developing the teacher's ability to enlarge the child's concepts of his immediate environment and the surrounding world. _____

53. Enables teachers to understand the use of dramatic play, real situations, and other opportunities for experiential learning in the classroom. _____

54. Helps staff with arrangements of room, building, and other environmental elements to provide an improved learning environment for children. _____

55. Elicits and makes use of ideas and suggestions from teachers and other school personnel. _____

Public Relations Competencies

56. Accurately identifies the characteristics of the community, such as social class(es), community power structure, cultural values, interest groups, and pressure groups. _____

57. Works effectively with interest groups and pressure components of the community. _____

58. Develops survey procedures suitable for assessing the educational needs and expectations indigenous to the community and child population. _____

59. Proposes educational programs appropriate to identified community and child needs. _____

60. Uses a variety of means for disseminating information about the school to the community. _____

61. Involves the teaching and paraprofessional staff in communicating the achievements, needs, and objectives of the school to parents

and the community. _____

62. Promotes community support for improving the quality of the school program and the environment. _____

63. Involves parents in the school program.

64. Involves parents in program planning and policy-making for the school. _____

65. Helps teaching staff develop a teacher-parent dialogue that involves sharing mutual perceptions of the child's strengths and potential, and planning cooperatively to meet the child's learning needs. _____

The following instrument, also from Bank Street College, was a basis for teacher-principal conversations in the Lower School at Sidwell Friends, as described above. The areas included are (1) general organization of the classroom, (2) opportunities for autonomous behavior (independent of adult supervision), (3) opportunities in the classroom for learning, (4) teaching strategies, (5) interpersonal relationships, (6) attitudes toward model, and (7) professional development.

General Organization of the Classroom

Grouping

There are opportunities for work in:

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Small groups—children and adults	_____	_____	_____	_____
Small groups—children alone	_____	_____	_____	_____
One-to-one situations—child and adult	_____	_____	_____	_____
Independent study—a child alone	_____	_____	_____	_____

Room Arrangement	Very effectively		Inadequately
The room is organized to further group and individual activities.	_____	_____	_____
The room is organized to facilitate the flow of activities.	_____	_____	_____
Management			
There is a framework within which the teacher can plan and develop curriculum.	_____	_____	_____
An organizational framework has been established within which the auxiliary			

personnel can contribute effectively to the classroom operation. _____ _____ _____

The teacher is able to integrate special activities effectively into the total program (e.g. trips, cooking, and issues which arise spontaneously out of the experiences of the children such as discussions focusing on the purpose of medical-dental examinations and what to expect). _____ _____ _____

Devices are present *and used* in the classroom operation by which children can assume responsibility for the functioning of the classroom society, e.g. attendance charts, job charts, choice charts, calendars maintained by children, etc. _____ _____ _____

Teachers and children have and use a record system for analyzing and reporting each individual's progress in reading. _____ _____ _____
Uses workbook only: Yes_____ No_____
Other (describe)_____

Teachers and children have and use a record system for analyzing and reporting each individual's progress in mathematics. _____ _____ _____
Uses workbook only: Yes_____ No_____
Other (describe)_____

Opportunities for Autonomous Behavior
(independent of adult supervision)

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Most of the children are given the opportunity to make choices about what they will do.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Most of the children are given specific responsibilities—projects independently of an adult, e.g., feeding animals, watering plants, attendance.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Most of the children use various types of materials (e.g., Cuisenaire rods, blocks, books, charts, language lotto games, etc.), through which they discover and learn independently.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Most of the children explore problems,				

constructively, e.g., (1) identify the problem, (2) organize an approach and (3) maintain the process to conclusion.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Most of the children express their needs and feelings to each other constructively and in the service of completing a task.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Small group activities occur in which children cooperate in a mutual endeavor which requires an exchange of ideas to complete the process (e.g., cooking, mural painting, play writing, etc.).	_____	_____	_____	_____
Children in a small group are pursuing different activities. (This includes small group activities in which everyone might be doing the same general task, e.g., reading, writing, math, but most persons are doing something different within that area.)	_____	_____	_____	_____

Opportunities in the Classroom for Learning
(For a more detailed assessment of this area, the evaluator should examine the rosters suggested for use by Bank Street.)

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Learning is based on experiences child has had, e.g., trips, use of manipulative materials such as Cuisenaire rods, reading games, blocks, etc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Children are given the opportunity to represent experiences through three-dimensional materials (e.g., blocks, Cuisenaire rods, woodworking, clay, science materials).	_____	_____	_____	_____
Children are given the opportunity to represent experiences through two-dimensional materials (e.g., painting, collages, drawing, use of pictures)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Children are helped to represent their experiences through use of writing.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Children are helped to represent their experiences through the use of mathematics (e.g., computation related to trips and other experiences).	_____	_____	_____	_____

Children have developed and are able to use their reading and language skills in problem solving appropriate to the age level.	____	____	____	____
Children have developed and are able to use computational skills appropriate to the age level in the mathematics and science areas for problem solving.	____	____	____	____
The products in the classroom (e.g., books and stories written by children, workbooks) evidence development of skills appropriate to the age level.	____	____	____	____
Materials are available for independent practice in the skills of the symbol systems: reading, writing, and math.	____	____	____	____
Materials are combined so that children can represent their experiences simultaneously through three- and two-dimensional materials and symbol systems, e.g., children reconstruct a trip using blocks, painting, clay modeling, writing, or dictating and reading for more information about what was studied during the trip.	____	____	____	____
Children are given opportunities for exchange of information about what they are studying through:				
Discussion groups	____	____	____	____
Listening to oral reports	____	____	____	____
Developing short plays	____	____	____	____
Reading what peers have written	____	____	____	____

Teaching Strategies

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Teacher spontaneously makes remarks about child's work in specific terms showing interest and appreciation of the process. (Teacher avoids judgmental remarks such as "Good" or "It makes *me* happy to see you can do that.")	____	____	____	____
Teacher shows respect for children's communication and work.	____	____	____	____

Teacher attends children's questions or comments with care. (Teacher does not reward child for work with grades, gold stars, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher attempts to elicit child's judgment of his work, e.g., "Can you tell me something about how you did this?" or "How do you feel about what you have done?" (Teacher does not make negative comparisons of children's work.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher displays children's work in such a way that it is accessible to children.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher deals with children's behavior in terms of resultant social or personal effectiveness. (Teacher does not judge children's behavior in terms of "good" or "bad" boys/girls. Teacher does not ask children to do things for him/her, e.g., "Would you write a story for me?")	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher speaks directly to individuals in small or large group activities rather than to the total group.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher asks questions which allow children to reconstruct experiences in comparison to questions which require a specific fact, e.g., "What were all the different jobs people worked at in the bakery?" vs. "What was Mr. Jones' job at the bakery?"	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher responds to child's remarks through suggestions which extend the child's thinking or activities, e.g., Child: "I saw a truck with boxes of vegetables in front of the store this morning." Teacher: "Where do you think the vegetables came from before they were on the truck?" and then listens!	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher responds to child's negative remark with a positive remark which enables the child to express feeling or confusion and to take responsibility for it, e.g., Child: "That was a stupid trip." Teacher: "That's interesting. I really would like to know why you feel that way." (And then listens to what the child				

has to say!)	____	____	____	____
Teacher elicits children's feelings about what they have experienced, e.g., "How did you feel when you rode on the escalator?" (Teacher does not belittle, make fun of children's feelings or attempt to impose his/her feelings on the children, e.g., "All children should love their parents!" or "Big boys don't cry.")	____	____	____	____
Teacher leads the teaching team so that it maximally supports the children's learning. (Please list reasons below for making this judgment. It is possible that the team is functioning well in some areas of the program and not so well in other areas.)	____	____	____	____

Interpersonal Relationships

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Teacher welcomes parent information and suggestions.	____	____	____	____
Teacher plans for parent participation.	____	____	____	____
Teacher finds a variety of ways of communicating with parents and of interpreting the model.	____	____	____	____
Teacher has a cooperative relationship with classroom paraprofessionals.	____	____	____	____
Teacher has planning meetings with assistants each day.	____	____	____	____
Teacher has planning meetings with assistants two times each week.	____	____	____	____
Teacher has planning meetings with assistants at least once a week.	____	____	____	____
Teacher seeks support of ancillary staff.	____	____	____	____
Teacher integrates information and suggestions of ancillary staff in planning for children.	____	____	____	____
Teacher seeks ideas from the staff developer.	____	____	____	____
Teacher is interested in using staff				

developer as a resource person if the staff developer takes the initiative.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher reluctantly uses staff developer as a resource person.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher refuses to use staff developer as a resource person.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Attitudes towards Model

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Teacher is enthusiastic about the model.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher is interested in the model but expresses doubts his/her ability to enact it.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher is unconvinced that the model should be implemented.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher is hostile to the model and has made it clear he/she will not implement it.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Professional Development

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Teacher participates in staff development meetings and workshops in community.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Teacher is willing to spend extra time, after school, his/her periods in school, or evenings and weekends to develop curriculum content. (Note: This is not required, of course; however, such interests as trips to a museum to see an African exhibit or an Indian exhibit or a trip to the library to find resource books, or extra reading about topics relevant to the educational process are all indices of an interest in professional development. Do *not* include college course work as an indication.)	_____	_____	_____	_____

Teacher is involved in graduate courses because the system requires it: Yes_____ No_____

Teacher is enrolled in courses (in any institution) because he/she is interested in the topic): Yes_____ No_____

The following guidelines for teacher evaluation were worked out by a committee of the Lower School faculty at Sidwell Friends School, as described in Janet Martin's comments at the start of this exhibit.

GUIDELINES FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

I. Positive Attitude towards Teaching
   A. As it affects children
      1. Concern for the total child: consideration for all aspects of the child, specifically interaction of social, emotional and academic needs
      2. Clear communication of teacher expectations in items of the child himself and the group, as to acceptable behavior and assumption of responsibilities
      3. Showing respect for children, leading to fairness in all judgments and dealings with them
      4. Showing appropriate physical warmth (we feel this is a key ingredient of a classroom atmosphere in a lower school)
      5. Using humor appropriately to set the tone for individuals and for the classroom
      6. Provision for meeting children's needs as individuals and as a group, with appropriate spontaneity and flexibility
   B. As it affects colleagues and parents
      1. Willingness to help, to share and discuss ideas, and to be supportive where necessary
      2. Active awareness of the need for joint responsibility for effectual functioning of the whole school
      3. Ability to accept constructive criticism
      4. Willingness to seek professional growth (workshops, in-service training, courses, research, etc.)
      5. Recognition of responsibility for self-evaluation

II. Philosophy-Organization-Management
   A. Seeking understanding and practice of Quaker philosophy
      1. Respect for and willingness to change
      2. Willingness to work toward consensus
      3. Sharing responsibility for direction and leadership
      4. Commitment to Quaker concept of the quintessential importance of the individual, as it relates to both children and teachers
      5. Awareness of the school's interrelationship with the community
      6. Awareness of the centrality of the meeting for worship in all aspects of the life of the school
   B. Acting on the tenets of Quaker philosophy in matters relating to organization-management of the whole school
      1. Assuming full responsibility for contributing, and participating in, decision-making, policy formation, and the implementation thereof
      2. Acceptance of out-of-class duties, including creative participation in committees and groups
      3. Awareness and conscientious use of proper channels for communications and expression of concerns

C. Organization-management of the classroom in order to reflect Quaker philosophy and goals for the individual
   1. Preparing the way for assumption by the child of responsibility for his own learning
   2. Thoughtfully organized room to facilitate all curriculum goals and to accommodate the flow of activities
   3. Provision for assumption of classroom responsibilities by the students
   4. Adequate record-keeping for documentation of the progress of the individual socially, emotionally, and academically
   5. Fulfillment of the responsibility for the four-part reporting system to parents
      a. Two narrative reports
      b. Two parent conferences
   6. Health and safety awareness
   7. Ability to employ consistent effective discipline, after having set reasonable standards for individual behavior

III. Curriculum
   A. Up-to-date awareness of the possibilities for expansion and integration of various modes and techniques into the work and goals of the classroom
   B. Well-planned use of curriculum materials, including manipulative and visual aids

Exhibit V

"Professional Staff"

Reprinted here is the section on "Professional Staff" from the *Manual for School Evaluation* published by the Commission on Independent Secondary Schools of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, 131 Middlesex Turnpike, Burlington, Mass. 01803. The 42 pages of this book are of major interest to any school any time, and not only during the crunch of its "outside" evaluation periods. This particular section raises good questions for a major soul-search in any explorative and professional faculty—or teacher.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

RATIONALE

The effectiveness of a school in achieving its stated purposes and objectives depends to a great extent on the quality of its professional staff. For the purposes of this section, professional staff includes those who are engaged in teaching or administration of the program of the school. It does not include personnel whose prime responsibility is an ancillary function such as business management, health or food services, or plant maintenance. The statement of purposes and objectives of the school provides a framework within which to judge the effectiveness of professional staff individual and collectively.

This section is concerned with the following:

—Describing the program of the school for its professional staff. Does the program create a climate for them to grow and develop as effective, mature people, skillful in the practice of their arts and steadily growing in the full range of human qualities?

—The development of judgments as to the suitability of the professional staff *as a whole* to meet the needs of students and the purposes and objectives of the school while at the same time fulfilling personal needs and attaining personal goals.

Professional staff are to be thought of in their primary roles and as individuals in groups adapting and responding to a particular environment, seeking to define and discharge particular responsibilities, and at the same time leading private lives and assuming as well community or public roles beyond the school.

A. The school has a procedure for identifying any changes in professional staff requirements; determining priorities for which staffing is needed; recruiting professional staff who are the best available for the tasks to be performed and for the style of the school; and for screening and interviewing candidates and providing them with necessary background information about the school.

B. Professional staff members are qualified in the areas to which they are assigned and there is an appropriate orientation program for staff members, particularly those new to the school.

C. The school has a program for continued professional development of the staff. This program takes into account the needs of individual staff members for professional and personal growth as well as the needs of the school, and is in keeping with the principles and assumptions of the sub-section entitled *Professional Development of Staff* [sub-section B, below].

D. The school has a procedure for evaluating professional staff performance that is defined as to purposes and provides a basis for decision about the individual's performance as a member of the school's professional staff.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING SECTION III, PROFESSIONAL STAFF

A. *Faculty and Administrative Personnel*

This sub-section should be completed by a person or persons responsible for recruiting professional staff personnel.

1. *Recruitment*

Professional staff openings are created by shifts of personnel, changes in enrollment, creation of new programs, and other factors.

a. Who is involved in identifying these openings: *e.g.*, do department heads, other faculty, administrative officers, the governing board, or students? When are these needs normally identified?

b. How successful have you found your procedures for identifying faculty needs? What changes, if any, are contemplated?

c. Many factors enter into the decision to employ a faculty member—competence, experience, special skills, versatility, rapport with students, etc. What are your priorities, and who develops them?

d. To what extent are teacher and staff placement agencies, college and university placement offices, etc., kept informed about the school and its particular style? Are they given specific job descriptions? Are personal contacts made with these agencies and placement offices? Do their representatives visit the school?

e. Give the number of successful applicants in the past few years from each of the following sources: 1) teacher and staff placement agencies, 2) college and university placement offices, 3) unsolicited applications and inquiries, 4) applications encouraged by the school's knowledge of a prospective candidate's professional reputation. How are inquiries from candi-

dates for faculty and staff openings handled?

f. Who initiates the first positive contact with the candidate? Who is involved in screening the preliminary *vitae*, dossier, or autobiographical sketch? Who decides whether to pursue discussions with the candidate?

g. Does your school seek out resourceful and talented prospective part-time faculty, teacher aides, or administrative personnel? (Example: parents, faculty spouses, retired persons, professional people, specialists in various fields, etc.)

h. Do you ask all candidates to come to the school for an interview and visit? Are candidates observed in a teaching situation or in performance of duties? Does the school pay for candidate visits to the school? If the candidate is married, is the spouse invited? With expenses paid?

i. If the interview is conducted at the school, who interviews the candidate and about how much time does each spend with the candidate? Who is responsible for acquainting him with the purposes and objectives of the school; the organization of instruction: *i.e.*, class decorum, class size, models of academic instruction; the intellectual climate; curricular and extracurricular activities; and the greater community of which the school is a part?

j. If the interview is not at the school, what procedures are followed to screen candidates?

k. Once the screening is accomplished, who is involved in the process of selecting the prime candidate and alternatives for a specific job? To what extent are department heads involved? Other faculty members? Members of the governing board? Students?

l. Who is responsible for: 1) reviewing with the candidate specifics of the position for which he is being considered; 2) discussing the position in terms of the candidate's career; 3) explaining the expectations the school has of members of the faculty; 4) making a specific offer and authorizing the proposed salary, fringe benefits, specific terms of employment; and, 5) signing the contract on behalf of the school?

m. How satisfied are you with the interaction between the school and prospective candidates during this selection process? If not, what changes should be made to effect the best possible match?

n. How satisfied are you with the candidates you are attracting in both number and quality?

o. List those persons responsible for the preparation of this subsection.

2. *Orientation*

The school may elect to have each of two faculty members, one new to teaching and one new to this school, prepare an account of his orientation, or the school may choose to have a committee formulate a response. In either case,

answers to questions 1-11 below will be included.

A teacher, whether new to teaching, or only new to the school, will be more effective if he understands the purposes and objectives of the institution and the particular or distinctive features of the school and its community.

a) *Before the opening of school*

1) Is there a faculty guide book or set of guidelines? When does the new teacher receive it?

2) To whom can the new teacher turn for answers to questions about the school, his various assigned duties, and his personal arrangements with the school?

3) When does he know specifically what courses are assigned to him? From whom does he receive copies of textbooks, other reading materials, course outlines? When? With whom can he discuss the academic work he is to undertake?

4) Is a new teacher involved in the selection of materials or curriculum planning for the coming year?

5) Does the school have expectations of the new teacher for professional study or course planning in the summer preceding his assumption of duties? Does the school fund such activity?

6) Does the new teacher report earlier than the "old hands"? Is an orientation program planned before the opening of school? Please describe.

b) *After the opening of school*

7) Does the new teacher receive continued guidance in planning: *i.e.*, does he receive help in the amount of work to assign students, use of class time, presentation of study techniques, classroom discipline, techniques for evaluating student performance?

8) What techniques are used to effect this continuing orientation? Faculty meetings, planned conferences with administrators, others?

9) Who is responsible for his continued guidance in each of the following areas as applicable: athletics, dormitory, extracurricular duties, as a new member of the school community, as a member of the community at large, in his relations with students, teachers, administrators, parents?

10) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the orientation of the new teacher? What changes might be effected to improve this aspect of the school's program?

11) List those persons responsible for the preparation of this subsection.

B. *Professional Development of Staff*

This entire sub-section on professional development should be prepared by a

faculty/staff committee, not solely by the chief administrative officer of the school.

The continued search by teachers old and new to broaden and deepen their knowledge, their understanding of the teaching-learning process, their understanding of young people, and their perception of themselves and their colleagues is a joint responsibility of the individual teachers and the school. The responsibility of a school, however, is to make every effort to insure the continued professional development of the faculty and staff, and to encourage them to keep abreast of modern thinking in their field.

The following assumptions continue to be made about professional staff members and are a basic element in the purpose of this section of this evaluation instrument.

—A staff member must steadily deepen and broaden his knowledge of his teaching field and related areas and stay intellectually alive.

—Equal effort must be made to foster growth in a teacher's mastery of the strategy, the art, and the craft of teaching, as well as his knowledge of the individual learner and the learning process and of the means for making groups work more effectively.

—Equal concern must also be exercised to promote a teacher's growth as an effective human being worthy of respect and emulation.

—The faculty as a whole must be aware of a broadened concept of the function of a school in the America of the 1970's: *e.g.*, new curriculum developments to meet changing student needs, newly felt obligations to educate disadvantaged and minority group children, fruitful use of off-campus experiences or projects of an educational but not always academic nature, and new ways of relating to the young, their interests, and their view of life today.

Questions 1-4 are designed to examine the attitude of the school toward the objective, discrete professional qualifications of members of the faculty and staff.

1. What is the policy of the school toward state certification of faculty and professional staff? Is it a factor in initial employment? Are those not now certified encouraged to become so? Do you feel certification is one valid measure of the professional qualification of a faculty or staff member? How familiar are administrators, governing body, and faculty at the school with state certification regulations and procedures?
2. Does the school require or encourage each faculty or staff member to take specific subject matter or professional course work for credit at regular intervals? Is this related to continuation of employment, salary increases, or promotion?
3. If the school has policies regarding items 1 and 2 above, how is information about these policies made available to the faculty?
4. Does the school assist a faculty member financially with further study wheth-

er for a degree program, promotion, or advancement, certification, or other purpose(s) specified by the school?

Questions 5-12 are designed to explore other types of professional development made available or encouraged by the school.

5. Does the school have a program of sabbatical leaves? How many faculty have participated in the past five years? Describe how leaves are funded and other conditions of the program.

6. Describe any recently held school-sponsored faculty and staff training institutes such as workshops devoted to audio-visual material, curriculum development, teaching techniques, the learning process, testing procedure and analysis, use of educational "hardware," psychology of adolescents, and group processes. Are consultants made available for this type of work?

7. Does the school encourage faculty and staff membership in and participation in professional associations or organizations? Who is responsible for payment of membership dues and expenses for attending meetings?

8. Describe the professional library resources available to the faculty and staff. Where are these resources located? How are decisions made as to what materials are included? What funds (amount) are allocated annually for these resources?

9. Describe a recent faculty or staff-oriented study of curriculum or other aspect(s) of the school program other than this evaluation. Did those involved feel this was a valuable professional development exercise?

10. Describe any school-sponsored inter-school faculty exchanges or visits.

11. What value is placed by the school on service by faculty and staff members on national, regional, or state professional committees?

12. Are funds available for other forms of professional development including financing original work of individual staff members?

13. List those persons contributing to the preparation of this sub-section.

C. *Evaluation of Professional Staff Performance and Career Guidance*

In full recognition of the pitfalls inherent in an endeavor to evaluate performance, it is felt that the professional staff member is entitled to responsible evaluation of his performance and that the school is entitled to have some measure of the performance of members of its staff in order to assure that the purposes and objectives of the school are being carried out.

The school may elect to have each of two faculty members, one in his first or second year of teaching, another one who has been at the school for a longer period, prepare an account of the evaluation of his professional staff performance. The school may choose to have a committee prepare the material. *In either case,* questions (a) through (i) in Sections 1 and 2 will be completed. [N.B. Evaluation of the performance of the chief administrative officer is covered in Sections V and VI.]

1. *Process of Evaluation*

   a. Describe the purposes and the relative importance of each for which professional staff evaluation is used: *e.g.*, career counseling, determining employment, determining financial or other rewards.

   b. Who shares in this evaluation and to what extent: *i.e.*, the administration, governing body, parents, students, department chairmen, other faculty, the individual himself, other agencies?

   c. What procedures are used by this school to evaluate a teacher's classroom performance? Who evaluates? How often? What instruments are used? Are students involved? Does the teacher conduct a self-evaluation? What use is made of this information?

   d. What procedures are used by this school to evaluate an administrative staff member's performance? Who evaluates? How often? What instruments are used? Are students involved? Does the staff member conduct a self-evaluation? What use is made of this information?

   e. Professional staff members at most independent schools have other than teaching responsibilities. Describe the procedures used to evaluate performance in the other areas of a teacher's responsibility.

   f. Are the evaluations of a professional staff member available to him and discussed with him? Who is responsible for this discussion?

2. *Career Guidance*

   g. Who is responsible for discussing with the teacher or staff member his continuing career in education? What elements are considered in this discussion: *e.g.*, the individual's basic talents and abilities, his current assignments, the needs of the school, the opportunities for professional growth, and skill development.

   h. Is there a specific stage in the individual's career at your school at which a decision is made about his future or long-range prospects there? Who is responsible for making this decision?

   i. List those persons responsible for the preparation of this sub-section.

D. *Staff Attitudes to In-Service Procedures*

It is requested that each member of the professional staff respond to this questionnaire and that the results be tabulated to show the responses in two categories—those at the school for *less than* five years and those at the school for *more than* five years.

Listed below are some steps which various schools are taking to invigorate teaching.* Please give us your assessment of their worth in relation to your school's needs by choosing from the following options: 1) Of little value to this school; 2) Valuable, but already satisfactorily implemented; 3) Should do more at this school; 4) Should do much more here.

	of little value	valuable but satis-factory	should do more	should do much more
Faculty attendance at professional conferences, getting outside school to observe teaching, exchange ideas, etc.	1	2	3	4
Program of sabbatical leaves, leave of absence to study or pursue other work	1	2	3	4
Class visits or supervision of *beginning* teachers by school head, department head, etc.	1	2	3	4
Class visits or supervision of *experienced* teachers by school head, department head, etc.	1	2	3	4
Voluntary exchange of class visits between teachers	1	2	3	4
Faculty study of educational research results, professional journals, and books on education	1	2	3	4
Use of audio or video recordings for assessment or self-analysis of teaching	1	2	3	4
Reduced teaching load for beginning teachers	1	2	3	4
Use of team teaching techniques, teaching assistants or aides	1	2	3	4
Variation in length, frequency, or size of class meetings for different purposes	1	2	3	4
College course work in professional education	1	2	3	4
Encouragement for additional graduate study during summers	1	2	3	4
Encouraging professional staff to become certified in their fields	1	2	3	4

*We are indebted to *A Study of the American Independent School* for permission to use this questionnaire.

Exhibit VI

Independent Schools and Teacher Evaluation

What are they doing?

Don't miss getting some really useful perspectives from the *Analytical Study of Instructional Personnel Policies in NAIS Member Schools*, a report prepared for NAIS in December 1972 by Henry Dahlberg, Jr. The 20 pages of this pamphlet cover important territory. Section VII, on "Evaluation," is included here if only for its rather startling picture of how few schools were, in December 1972, shaping or using some kind of teacher-evaluation process. Startling, perhaps, but heartening in another way, since today schools can't simply call up a few other schools, or reach for a book, and assume that they can get a ready-made, tested evaluation package that will work in their school. They have to go to work on it from within.

A. *Does the school have a formal written plan for continuing self-evaluation of its academic program developed by the staff and separate from an evaluative procedure established by an accrediting agency?*

Yes: 42 (6.9%) *No:* 554 (91.7%) *No response:* 8 (1.2%)

1. *If "yes," was the instrument primarily developed by: The faculty?* 1 *The administration?* 6 *Cooperatively?* 39

B. *How is the teaching competence of faculty members evaluated?* [Responses are listed in order of importance.]

a. *Classroom observation by headmaster or headmistress* and
b. *Classroom observation by department head*

These two evaluation procedures, dicussed jointly, were the two most important methods, with (a) receiving first rank from 29.3% and (b) from 30.6% of the schools responding. There was a significant tendency for smaller schools and those with lower median salaries to rely on evaluation by the head of the school.

e. *Comments from parents, students, the teacher, and his colleagues* were the second most popular method. Fifty per cent of schools having over 800 students did not use this method at all, however.

h. *How well the teacher's students succeed in the future at the school and at other academic institutions later on* was the third-ranking method. Schools with lower median salaries tended to use it more often than those with higher medians.

f. *The performance of the teacher's students on standardized exams* received a fairly weak response, with 60.4% of the schools failing to rank it at all.

g. *Self-evaluation by the teacher* was not ranked by 63.9% of the schools.

c. *Evaluation by teacher and administrators, using an agreed-upon criterion,* was an extremely little-used method, with 71.8% of the schools not ranking it at all. This method was used by a comparatively greater number (39.9%) of schools having over 800 students, however.

d. *Student evaluation of teacher (written)* was the least-used method, with 81.8% of the schools failing to rank it at all.

An effort to find out current news

One of the top-priority concerns of the Academic Committee of NAIS since it first met in spring 1974 has been the idea of exploring teacher evaluation. This report speaks to part of that concern.

Another effort is the following questionnaire, prepared by a member of the Academic Committee, Peter Buttenheim. Mr. Buttenheim was a teacher at Princeton Day School and this year is with the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies program at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. The questionnaire, originally sent to the people in the 1974 Graduate Summer School program at Wesleyan, is finding its way considerably beyond that group, and the first returns on it are extraordinarily interesting.

During 1974-75 and 1975-76, this instrument will be circulated among a random sample of independent school teachers. We urge readers who do not receive one and who are interested in pursuing the subject to copy the questionnaire printed here, fill it in, and mail it to Peter Buttenheim, NAIS Teacher Survey, National Association of Independent Schools, 4 Liberty Square, Boston, Mass. 02109. Readers may also find the questionnaire helpful for use within the school by teachers and administrators to share past experiences in the areas of evaluation and personal growth.

In a cover letter appended to the questionnaire, Mr. Buttenheim says:

> I have made out a very simple questionnaire . . . divided into two parts: teacher evaluation and professional growth. Would you please assist us by taking some time to answer the questions and comment where it seems to you appropriate? I promise you that your answers will remain only in my possession; leave your name or school off if you are concerned about confidentiality. Your help will assist us greatly in our effort to find out about the experiences teachers are having (and are not having) in the areas of evaluation and professional growth in our schools. Please feel free to go beyond what is asked for here.

NAIS ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

SURVEY ON TEACHER EVALUATION AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Date_____

Your name_____ Age_____

Undergraduate college_____ Years of Teaching_____

Current school_____

Previous jobs_____

_____

Teacher Evaluation

1. List how many times you have been evaluated in the classroom. (Exclude casual visits to the classroom.) Give number of evaluations by: *Headmaster*_____ *Department head*_____ *Parents*_____ *Colleagues*_____ *Member of an outside evaluation team*_____ *Others*_____ (say who on back)

2. Have you ever done a self-evaluation of your work as a teacher? *Yes*_____ *No*_____. If you have, then list the criteria you used or enclose a copy of the form.

3. In what ways did your school "follow up" the evaluations you just mentioned in Questions 1 and 2 above? In the space below, describe how your strengths and weaknesses were made known to you. Include such things as 1-1 talks with the Headmaster, a session with your department head, department meetings, and so on.

4. Please explain the differences between how you have been evaluated in the past and how you would *like* to be evaluated. Are there people not presently engaged in evaluating you who would be excellent at that task? Who?

5. Do you think that the NAIS should set up evaluation standards which *could* be used by member schools if they so desired? *Yes*_____ *No*_____. If "yes," then what objective criteria should be listed on such a form?

6. Should the evaluation of teachers be related to faculty salaries? Please explain your answer.

7. Have you ever served on an evaluation team either within your own school or at another school? *Yes*_____*No*_____. If "yes," please describe the experience in terms of your own growth. If "no" please indicate if you would like to be part of such a program.

Professional Growth

1. List all workshops, conferences, conventions, professional meetings, retreats, and the like which you have attended during your teaching career. If possible, please give approximate date(s), location, and sponsor(s). Please rank each item by the following code: 5 = Outstanding! 4 = Well worth it! 3 = Productive but not exciting; 2 = Could be improved/did not meet advanced billing; 1 = Save your money/stay home/avoid.

2. List all advanced degrees (beyond B.A. or B.S.), summer schools, summer institutes, foreign travels and other formal educational endeavors that you have been a part of.
   a. Please rank these items as you did in Question 1 above.
   b. Briefly explain which item helped you grow the most as a person.
   c. Briefly explain which item helped you grow the most as a teacher.
   d. Is there an item in Question 2 which you would unhesitatingly recommend to any teacher?

3. Below, list friends, administrators, colleagues, students, and others who have helped you grow professionally. If you wish, give a summary of each person's influence on you.

4. Does your school offer in-service training to assist you in your growth and development as a teacher? *Yes*_____ *No*_____. If "yes," what kinds of programs does your school conduct? (Please enclose any printed material you can.) How do these sessions help you? If "no," would you like your school to offer such training programs? *Yes*_____ *No*_____(In what areas, if "yes"?)

5. List key books you have read which have directly helped you improve your teaching.

6. Describe any "intangible thing" (religion, philosophy, precepts, values, etc.)

which helps you prosper and survive as a teacher. Try to put this abstract thing into words if you can. This is not a curve ball; I'm serious.

7. Does your day-to-day work load give you enough time to plan, think, relax, and recharge? *Yes*_____ *No*_____. If "no," describe how more such time would improve your effectiveness as a teacher.

8. List experimental projects, team teaching programs, educational alternatives, etc., in which you have taken an active part. How did these "innovative" programs improve your teaching skills?

9. Does your school have funds for summer study, workshops, institutes, and other such things which are available to you for your professional growth? *Yes*_____ *No*_____

On all answers, please use the back of this sheet or additional sheets if you desire to answer questions in detail. Please comment on anything that this survey has brought to your mind. Again, my deepest thanks for taking time to do this survey. *P.V.B.*

Exhibit VII

A Useful Perspective on Teacher-Students-Curriculum in Evaluation

The following article, reprinted from the summer 1971 issue of *The Journal of Teacher Education*, has a title that is exactly the kind that could turn off independent school people because it sounds anti-liberal arts and supposedly pseudo-scientific. The article's point of view neatly refutes this, though its tone and content make clear that there is no apologizing for a systematic, rigorous approach to the teaching and curriculum involved here. Note, too, that the teacher's own evaluation process, with the curriculum materials and with the students, is crucial to the message of the article. It reminds us again that teacher evaluation does not happen only from "outside," and that it makes no sense without the context of the teacher, the students, and the curriculum materials and activities.

Mrs. Bauer was 15 years a teacher at the Kingswood School, in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, and for five of those years was chairman of the history department. She had this to say about some of the language in the article, when I asked permission to reprint it here and after I had written the note above: "The technical language rings oddly to me now, three years later. It came out of those 'Camelot' years of *The Best and the Brightest*. I've realized by now that the climate of every classroom has so much to do with the respect of teachers and students for each other, that words like 'strategies,' 'teaching techniques,' even 'curriculum,' seem impersonal and inadequate. I still feel that as teachers we need to feel both responsible and guilty—responsible when things work and guilty when they don't. I am interested in the way in which we *increase the likelihood* that students will take the opportunities we help create. There are things we can do to strengthen the odds that they will . . ."

When Mrs. Bauer wrote this article, she was a Fellow of the Learning Systems Institute at Michigan State University in East Lansing. She is now an author, educational consultant, and curriculum designer. Her new text series, *The Social Sciences: Concepts and Values*, is published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

The Social Science Teacher as Clinician: The Role and the Curriculum

Nancy W. Bauer

T. S. Eliot tells us that "we measure out our lives in coffee spoons." Not so for teachers. The measure of the life of a teacher is the constant revision of the curriculum. For all teachers, it is a continuous awareness of the child as an individual; and for social science teachers, it is the guiding of a child to make educated choices. Developing the ability to make such choices is the real meaning of individualized learning in social science, and the personal and pragmatic meaning of freedom in a democracy. To this end, the teacher must turn clinician.

Teacher education, particularly since Flanders, has focused sharply on identification of specific teaching behaviors.[1] The selection of these behaviors and their sequence depends, of course, on priorities. This paper proposes for priority among the variety of functions teachers can perform those that fulfill the role of clinician. What are the behaviors associated with this role? A clinician is responsible for on-the-spot application of research findings in diagnosing needs and prescribing to meet those needs. A clinician can diagnose an individual's needs by observing his responses and relating them to the findings of research. In this way he makes a diagnosis and determines the prescription; he evaluates the response of the patient or client to the prescribed treatment and, if advisable, changes the prescription. It is the individual skilled in clinical practice that feeds back the research data that either support or question the original hypotheses and confirm or modify the recommendations for prescription and treatment.

The teacher is the only on-the-spot representative of the education profession. Only the teacher in the day-by-day interaction of the classroom can diagnose and prescribe for an individual student's needs. The role of the professional physician in clinical practice is to observe, analyze, prescribe, evaluate, and modify. This paper proposes that a teacher also can be an effective clinician if he has the same support physicians have. The structure of the curriculum must provide that support.

Significant work has been done by Ward to order into a sequence those behaviors essential to the on-the-spot decision-making role of teachers. He has developed a cyclical model that delineates the stages of decision making followed by a teacher in a classroom if he is acting as a clinician to help real children-clients: "Such a clinical cycle of procedures . . . can be expressed as a three-segment circle of dynamic processes: hypothesizing, acting, and evaluating. . . . [In] the cyclical procedure . . . methodology is seen as a set of hypotheses which consistently regularize practice, practice leads to evaluation, and evaluation of the consequences of a practice leads to modifications in the hypotheses—either change or reinforcement."[2]

This is clinical behavior, and it is for professionals only. This is the method of

[1]A detailed classification of teaching behaviors, with minimum or criterion levels of those behaviors, has been developed as a monograph by the Tri-University Project in Elementary Education (Social Science - Social Studies), University of Washington, John Jarolimek and Phillip Bacon, co-directors. See *A Behavioral Approach to the Teaching of Social Studies: An Application of Cognitive and Affective Process Models, Performance Tasks and Criterion Measures* (Seattle: University of Washington, 1968).

[2]Ted W. Ward, "Developing Teacher Behavior in Clinical Settings," *Internships in Teacher Education*, 1968 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, National Education Association, 1968), pp. 154-155.

diagnosis and prescription. Before hypotheses must come academic insight into setting objectives. Hypotheses are ways of achieving these objectives and of assuming the existence of certain conditions in the patient, client, or learner. Obviously, between hypothesizing and action choosing must come observation, analysis, and diagnosis.

Academic Insight in Setting the Objectives and Developing the Hypotheses

The initial step in clinical behavior is based on understanding the depth and breadth of the goals of the field in which the clinician operates. Hypotheses for clinical action would be the objectives of these goals. Who establishes them? The research scientists in the social science disciplines, in developmental psychology, and learning theory determine what concepts are supportable and what goals appear possible. Together with the teacher and the community they determine which goals are most desirable.

As we delineate these stepped-up learning objectives for children, we are faced with crucial questions: Does the teacher have to know how to do them too? Does he have to be totally familiar with the samples of content in order for the objectives to be reached? Does he have to be a concept-user, a concept-seeker in order to help a child become one? In all honesty, many adults—and some teachers among them—are not aware that scientists classify information in this way. For example, there are many who, although they know the facts of America in 1776 and 1861, France in 1789, Russia in 1914, China in 1949, and Vietnam since 1954, have not formed a concept of revolution. There are those who belong to groups and yet do not understand the concept of group.

How much does such an adult have to know and do to be a clinician in a concept-centered social science curriculum? If a curriculum offers the teacher nothing but data organized by generalizations fed to the children in narrative form, then the new social science will be equally superficial and the expected learning outcomes will turn out to be only fond hopes. Provided the curriculum offers the support to the professional teacher that medical books offer to physicians, the teacher does not have to be a natural at social science concepts to be effective. The structure of the concepts on which the curriculum is based, explanation of the generalizations considered supportable by the latest research, and the reason for their selection for the children must be provided for the teacher. How can a teacher be asked if curriculum goals are being met by actions in the classroom if the goals are not clearly spelled out? Behavioral objectives must not only be identifiable but also acceptable to the scholars of the disciplines and the learning theorists.

The omnicapable teacher at the elementary level no longer exists. Even more selective must be the teacher at the secondary level. Classroom experiences cannot be limited to what the teacher knows; yet, the allotment of a teacher's time for researching, course participation, and lesson preparation would reveal grave inadequacies. Imagine the calling cards: "Practice limited to science, mathematics, social science, language arts, lunchroom supervision, playground and developmental psychology"!

A social science curriculum cannot be teacher proof, but it must be teacher freeing. The social science curriculum can provide the educational engineering to integrate the concepts of the academic disciplines with teaching and learning strategies and personal value seeking. The teacher in a single classroom can be free to teach real children, who differ markedly from each other in depth and breadth of experience and understanding.

The Diagnostic Phase

The standard teacher's manual does not even deal with the diagnostic phase of clinical behavior. It assumes that all children who are going to get the treatment have already undergone some kind of observation and analysis of their symptoms and that reading chapter 1 or seeing the filmstrip or movie will be good for what ails them. When and how a teacher was supposed to have done this is simply not considered part of the curriculum's responsibility.

A second significant criterion for a curriculum that supports the teacher's role as clinician is that it should provide dynamic situations to which the children will react as individuals, so that their differences in skills, attitudes, concerns, and modes of interaction with each other will become overt. Then the teacher can observe them and record where they are, what they probably need, and the kind of learning experiences (the prescription) they might benefit from the most. In skill subjects, such diagnostic tools can often be pretests; in social science, they must be actual classroom happenings. One relevant experience to which the response will be individual does more to aid in diagnosis in the social sciences than separate pretests that require no exposure of attitudes, feelings, misconceptions, and difficulty in communication. The social sciences are *about* human interaction; no one will be blank on the subject, because all come to school with enormous amounts of random personal data on all the concepts: group behavior, conflict, values, leadership, economic choice, and social change.

Teachers are the only professionals who have been expected to work alone in concocting diagnostic questions that will also be motivating situations. They have had to do this on the spot or after hours for thirty individuals at a time! It is true that in the interaction of the classroom only the teacher can determine the probable cause of each student's behavior and his place on the continuum of learning The curriculum must, therefore, free the teacher by providing him with diagnostic situations by which he can judge the needs of each child.

The Prescriptive Phase

Establishing hypotheses and making diagnoses can be useless and heartbreaking if there are no alternative treatments: "A question or a problem improperly designed, a question that does not mesh with the conceptual platform of the child, with his present abstractions, can crush him. A teacher must proceed with caution, taking into account the child's growth in concepts and values. He must build on the known."[3]

A physician selects medication and treatment from a variety of materials and methods developed by university colleagues and private industries. A teacher often has only one available treatment for all situations, the narrative text, or he is forced for the sake of variety to create several possibilities himself, try them out, and evaluate them, while diagnosing and prescribing for the individual. Even multimedia, programed learning, and teaching machines are often guilty of this one approach for all. Therefore, a third criterion for the fashioning of a curriculum that frees the teacher to be a professional clinician should be the provision of a bank of alternatives suited to the style, needs, and strengths of individual students. What kinds of alternatives are needed? We know, for instance, that everyone is not verbal; we

[3]Paul F. Brandwein, *Toward a Discipline of Responsible Consent* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1969), p. 29.

must provide the social science teacher with nonverbal (visual- and action-oriented) ways of helping children reach the objectives.

The method of testing must match the mode of learning. A child who does not read and write well could hardly be expected to pass a course in human interaction if the course is not presented at the child's own mode and level of response.

How does a social science curriculum provide flexibility and still accomplish its objectives?[4] First of all the text itself cannot be purely narrative and descriptive; if it is investigative in form and conceptual in organization, the nonreader can be read to without depriving him of the learning experience. If, for instance, the text shows him data in words and pictures on people of different ages, races, and cultural background, he can discover for himself the idea of likenesses and differences and add examples of his own. The teacher can help make his own investigations of social science concepts in his own environment. He can be asked to bring data from his own experience that he can proudly add to the samples of content from which the concepts are built.

If the teacher who has diagnosed the children's needs is given clear-cut purposes or reasons for each section of the learning sequence and a bank of alternative actions, he can tune the curriculum to his own classroom situation, and even to individual children. He can choose the action that will produce the desired result for his class, just as the physician chooses for a particular patient the treatment he feels will produce the best results with the fewest side effects. The teacher needs not only a sequential but also a branching curriculum (for concept building and cognitive skill development) in order that he may choose what is best for each child. If one learning experience doesn't work well for all, he can choose another; or if it is helpful to divide the class into groups, they will not all be forced to approach learning in the same way.

A curriculum that can be made relevant to the individual teacher and student is particularly necessary in the social sciences and history, because both the people studied and those who do the studying are involved with varieties of human interaction, individual perspectives, and emotional responses. Making it possible for a social science teacher to be a clinician requires a broadened definition of curriculum: it must include not only the structure but also a flexible approach to what the children and teachers do.

Evaluation

The final criterion for clinical behavior is the ability to evaluate the response and adjust the action accordingly. Physicians and teachers are both involved in testing as they go. Many teachers are wary of evaluating, and if all they have is the equivalent of one medicine bottle, they have reason to be. Even with a variety of alternatives, a teacher needs support from his colleagues to admit failure and try out other people's successes. The medical associations aid in communicating to fellow doctors new tests and new results. It has been said that teachers who are not skilled in the higher reaches of the academic disciplines, for instance in mathematics, have had difficulty interpreting the significance of children's errors. If the curriculum accepts its responsibility, it will aid the teacher in observing and evaluating children's responses.

[4]All examples are from a curriculum design developed by The Center for the Study of Instruction (division of Harcourt, Brace and World), for which the writer is a research associate.

A teacher, like a physician, can be helped with a list of some of the possible responses to treatment, as well as a list of essential responses. If the essential responses (in the children's own words, at their own level of response) are not in evidence, the action taken can be said to have been proved ineffective. A curriculum that supports clinical behavior of teachers must be willing to admit that it may not work with all classes and must offer some alternatives keyed to the purpose originally stated. Negative or hostile responses of children to an approach need to be evaluated objectively and an alternate approach selected. This is particularly necessary in a social science curriculum, where a problem or issue always involves differences in values. Sometimes children's responses are off the point; the teacher needs to be able to recognize these as clues to snags in understanding. Sometimes the responses are incomplete; sometimes, there is no response at all. In each case the teacher needs questioning strategies and learning tasks that will explore for all possible hang-ups and reveal their probable causes. This kind of evaluation is ongoing. It relates to that part of Ward's model in which the teacher continually observes and objectively evaluates the performance of each task and the response to each questioning sequence.

There must also be provision for periodic evaluation, verifying student progress from lesson to lesson and from unit to unit. Some programs in communication and mathematical skills have been quite successful in listing behaviors expected of children and giving new sentences and problems on which they can demonstrate their ability.

Social science is not primarily a skill subject; periodic evaluation has to allow for different attitudes, values, family background levels of cognitive abstraction, and social and emotional sophistication. Testing for recall of the old data is not the answer. As in the skill subjects, evaluation should be on new data, in new situations using the same concepts and value-seeking issues that were the frame for the original presentation. A supportive curriculum will provide teachers with tests that show how well the children's learning transfers to a new, yet comparable, situation. Some teachers like to invent their own; for others, this is very time-consuming. Teachers, like physicians, need suggestions and models for testing with which they can at least make a start.

The problem lies not with teachers but with curriculum design. If the curriculum supports clinical practice—diagnosis, prescription, evaluation, and adjustment—the in-service design can be individualized and practical. It is time to distribute responsibility and restructure resources in order to enhance the teacher's unique strength. In the setting of a supportive curriculum, a teacher *can* be a clinician. A machine can talk, but only a teacher can listen, observe, understand, and interact with each child.

Exhibit VIII

A Self-Assessment Questionnaire on Personal and Social Learning

In 1973, the Counseling and Guidance Committee of the National Association of Independent Schools published some perceptive and explorative materials for schools interested in improving their counseling and guidance programs. The questionnaire is reprinted here, though schools are urged to write for the much more extensive Leader's Guide. The guide includes self-assessment materials and discussion of goals, actual educational programs, things to work with for teachers and staff, climate of learning, organization and administration of the school community, a section on counseling the minority-group student, and some straight, challenging talk from the committee on its own rationale and convictions. The bibliography at the end of the guide is crucial to any faculty taking a look at itself.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMS FOR PERSONAL AND SOCIAL LEARNING

I. Goals of the School

A. 1. By whom, and through what processes, are the school's goals determined?

2. How do the needs and capabilities of students and other members of the school community influence the formulation of these goals?

B. 1. Is the statement of goals sufficiently clear and specific to serve as a basis for programs in personal and social learning?

2. What do the goals imply about the desired relationship in human affairs between:
   a. competition and cooperation?
   b. stability and change?
   c. homogeneity and diversity?

3. What do the goals imply to be the significant differences between children of various ages and adults?

C. 1. How are the school's goals communicated to members of the school community and to members of the wider community?

2. How does the school seek to learn if its goals are understood by members of the school community?

II. Educational Program for Personal and Social Learning

A. 1. How are specific objectives for personal and social learning determined?

2. To what extent are they described in terms of observable behavior?

3. If they are not described, and the school feels they should not be, what criteria does the school use in assessing the effectiveness of its program?

B. 1. What objectives for personal and social learning are pursued as part of the instructional program?

2. Who is responsible to oversee the implementation of these objectives and to assess the extent to which they are being attained?

C. What opportunities are provided elsewhere in the school's total educational program for students to use and reinforce what they have learned in specific instructional programs?

D. 1. What objectives for personal and social learning are pursued through counseling relationships of various kinds?

2. Who is responsible for overseeing the counseling program and for assessing the extent to which its objectives are being attained?

E. 1. How are opportunities for counseling made known to students?

2. How available are counseling opportunities in relation to other demands on students' time?

F. 1. How does the school seek to identify and provide for the special needs of students who are educationally and/or economically disadvantaged?

2. How does the school seek to identify and provide for the special needs of students who are members of racial and cultural minorities in the school or in the society?

G. What provision is made for communication among those who counsel, those who teach, and those who have other relationships with students?

H. 1. What use does the school make of standardized and diagnostic tests for both groups and individuals?

2. Who has access to the results of these tests?

3. Who is responsible for administering the tests and interpreting their results?

4. Who is responsible for communicating with students and their parents about these tests and their findings?

I. 1. How does the school use the resources of the surrounding community in planning and implementing its program for personal and social learning?

2. How does the school use the resources of the surrounding community in meeting the particular needs of groups and individuals within the school?

J. 1. How has the program for personal and social learning changed during the past two years in response to students' needs?

2. How has the program for personal and social learning changed during the past two years in response to the needs of other members of the school community?

III. Teachers and Other Employees

A. What kinds of information does the school seek to convey to and obtain from prospective faculty members and other employees?

B. How are faculty members and other employees informed of their responsibilities and of the regulations and expectations that affect them?

C. 1. How does the school assess the professional competence and growth of members of the faculty?

2. What role does a teacher have in assessing the quality of his work?

3. What role do students have in evaluating the work of their teachers?

D. What are faculty members' attitudes and priorities regarding their own personal and social learning in relation to other kinds of learning?

E. How are programs for continuing faculty learning planned, implemented and evaluated?

F. 1. How does the school provide teachers with sufficient opportunity for self-renewal?

2. Is released time made available for this purpose?

G. How does the school seek to insure that teachers' styles and methods complement one another and are consistent with the goals and objectives of the school?

H. 1. What is done to help other employees be aware of their impact on the personal and social learning of students?

2. In what ways are non-teaching employees expected to contribute to the personal and social learning of students?

I. What steps do members of the administration take to insure that their relationships with faculty and other employees, and the relationships among faculty and other employees, provide a desirable model for students?

IV. Climate for Learning

A. How does the school use its physical environment to create favorable conditions for learning?

B. 1. What kinds of information does the school seek to convey and obtain through contacts with prospective students and their parents?

2. What criteria are involved in selecting students for admission?

3. To what extent are these criteria shared with students and/or parents?

C. 1. How are students made familiar with the school's rules, procedures, activities and expectations each year?

2. What special arrangements are made for those new to the school?

D. 1. What are the normal procedures for dealing with an individual who is suspected of disregarding or violating school rules and expectations?

2. What does the school regard as the legitimate rights of a student under these circumstances?

3. What sanctions and punishments may normally be involved?

E. Questions for teachers

1. a. How do you assess the needs, capabilities and interests of your students?

b. To what extent and in what ways do these judgments influence the content and methods of your teaching?

2. How do you assess the impact of your teaching style and methods on the personal and social learning of your students?

3. How are you apt to learn of an important influence you are having—either positive or negative—on an individual or on a group of students?

4. What are you apt to do if a particular student disrupts normal classroom activities, or if a student refuses to cooperate with you?

F. 1. Describe the procedures for assessing and reporting on the learning of individual students.

2. To what extent do these procedures deal with other than academic learning?

3. How does the school find out whether reports of various kinds are understood by the student and/or parents who receive them?

G. What role does a student have in the process of assessing and reporting on his/her learning?

H. What happens if the learning of a particular student is deemed to be inadequate or insufficient?

I. 1. What kinds of excellence does the school seek to recognize in students?

2. To what extent does the school provide opportunity for diverse forms of accomplishment?

3. By what means and in what ways is this done?

4. To what extent and in what ways does the school seek to recognize the efforts of all students?

V. Organization and Administration of the School Community

A. 1. How are various members of the school community—governing board, administration, faculty, other employees, students, parents, alumni, others—kept informed of current developments which affect them?

2. What criteria are used to decide when various members of the school community need to be informed about a particular matter?

B. 1. How do various members of the school community individually and collectively communicate their needs to the school?

2. What happens to a new idea?

C. 1. What kinds of decisions are made by various members of the school community—individually, collectively, or by representation—which have an impact on the school and its program?

2. What information is sought in making these decisions?

3. What information is provided whether or not it is solicited?

4. How, and by whom, are the decisions implemented?

D. 1. In what areas do various members of the school community expect to be informed of decisions made by others and the reasons for making them?

2. In what areas is it understood that decisions and the reasons for making them are confidential?

E. 1. How are individuals and groups within the school helped to communicate more effectively?

2. How are individuals and groups within the school helped to improve their ability to make independent and/or collaborative decisions?

END